May 1992

Advisement Effectiveness and Self-directed Learning: A Comparison Between Traditional and Non-traditional Students in Selected Regional Universities in Tennessee

James L. Daniel
East Tennessee State University

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9222253

Advisement effectiveness and self-directed learning: A comparison between traditional and non-traditional students in selected regional universities in Tennessee

Daniel, James Lynn, Ed.D.

East Tennessee State University, 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Advisement Effectiveness and Self-Directed Learning: A Comparison Between Traditional and Non-Traditional Students in Selected Regional Universities in Tennessee

---

A Dissertation

presented to

The Faculty of the Department of

Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

East Tennessee State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by

James L. Daniel

May 1992

APPROVAL

This is to certify that the Graduate Committee of

JAMES LYNN DANIEL

met on the

5th day of February, 1992.

The Committee read and examined his dissertation, supervised his defense of it in an oral examination, and decided to recommend that his study be submitted to the Graduate Council and the Associate Vice-President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

W. Hal Knight
Chairman, Graduate Committee

Signed on behalf of the Graduate Council

Associate Vice-President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School

Abstract

ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT EFFECTIVENESS AND SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING: A COMPARISON BETWEEN TRADITIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS IN SELECTED REGIONAL UNIVERSITIES IN TENNESSEE

by

James L. Daniel

In the past, the majority of students entered college shortly after graduation from high school and attended for four consecutive years until receiving a degree. Most of these students also resided on or close to the campus and attended classes on a full-time basis. However, students who live on campus and go to school full-time have become a minority and not a majority on many college campuses.

Most colleges now have significant non-traditional populations. Not only are the students older, but they are also different from past student populations in that many are married, single parents, work full-time jobs, and/or commute from their homes on a daily basis to attend classes. Because most academic advisement programs were established to accomodate traditional student populations, it was the purpose of this study to compare the effectiveness of these systems as perceived by traditional and non-traditional undergraduate students at three of Tennessee's regional universities. Traditional and non-traditional students were also compared on the extent to which they exhibit self-directed learning.

A comparison of mean scores was made for responses made to items contained in the American College Testing (ACT) Survey of Academic Advising, including the total mean score for the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (OCLI) between traditional/non-traditional students, full-time/part-time students, students at the three universities, males/females, students of different races, and married/unmarried students.

There were no significant differences found as to the perception of overall advisement effectiveness between traditional/non-traditional students, full-time/part-time students, students at the three universities, males/females, students of different races, or married/unmarried students. However, differences were found to among the groups. Part-time students were more satisfied with the performance of their advisors in relation to various questions than full-time students. Non-traditional students were generally more satisfied with their personal relationship with their advisors and also obtained a higher mean score on the OCLI

than traditional students. Significant differences were found among students responding from the three universities to questions regarding advisor availability, referrals by advisors, and the initiation of meetings on the part of the advisor.

It is recommended that academic advisement programs be evaluated on a continuing basis and that advisors be made available to meet the needs of various groups represented in each college, especially part-time and non-traditional students. It is also recommended that more research be conducted relative to the various groups that presently make up student populations as to possible correlation between various individual and group characteristics that might impact academic advisement. Included in those additional studies could be examination of differences of perceived advisement between students at various types and sizes of institutions as well as a comparison of perceived advisement effectiveness between institutions having various student/advisor ratios.

Further study is recommended as to the validity and reliability of the OCLI as a measure of self-directed learning characteristics. Also recommended is the study of the concept of self-directed learning characteristics, especially as to whether or not self-directed learning characteristics are exclusively a product of maturation or if these characteristics can be enhanced, developed, and encouraged.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This is in grateful acknowledgment of the patience, understanding and expertise of the committee: Dr. Hal Knight, Chairman; Dr. Nancy Garland; Dr. Russell West; Dr. Floyd Edwards; and Dr. Robert Spangler, without whose help and guidance this dissertation could not have been completed.

I would also like to thank my family, especially my wife, Cynthia, for their love, support, and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

Introduction

The number of adult or non-traditional students has grown steadily in this country since the Second World War (Trow, 1988). Shere (1988) indicated that the decade of the 1980s may be the turning point in the trend toward higher education for non-traditional students. Recently the College Board (1989) predicted that "By 1993, half of all college students will be age 25 and older" (p. 1). Several researchers (Holtzclaw, 1988; Werring, 1987; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1986; Lynch, Doyle, & Chickering, 1985; Rauch, 1981; Truskie, 1981; Zemke & Zemke, 1981) have explored the characteristics of non-traditional students and their implications for administrators in higher education.

As the non-traditional student population becomes increasingly prominent on college campuses, it also becomes important for educational administrators to understand the needs and characteristics of non-traditional students, especially as they differ from the traditional college population. The need for understanding of non-traditional students is important as they enter college (Warner, 1985), as they continue their education, and as they complete or terminate their education (Brown & Robinson, 1988). This understanding also has an impact on the content of graduating classes (Pierson & Springer, 1988).

Academic advisement of college students is generally recognized as very important. Habley and Crockett (1988) reported that "academic advisement remains the most significant mechanism available" (p. 27) on most college campuses to provide students with the proper motivation, not only to attend higher education, but to complete their education. Most academic advisement programs were established for student populations where a very high percentage of the students were traditional students. Many of those programs have not been re-evaluated (Polson & Ericksen, 1988) since non-traditional students have become such an important segment on college campuses. Srebnik (1988) emphasized the need for evaluation of how students perceive advisement. The author referred to the surveys in 1979 and 1983 of advisement by the American College Testing Program (ACT). The results of these two surveys indicated that 75 % and 76 % of responding institutions, respectively, had no evaluation of their advisement programs. The lack of advisement assessment by students is especially significant because of the influx of non-traditional students, who have been found to have somewhat different advisement needs (Dean, Eriksen, & Lindamood, 1987) when compared to traditional students.

Statement of the Problem

Academic advisement programs that were established before the influx of non-traditional college students, which

have not been adequately assessed and altered accordingly, may not be satisfactorily meeting the needs of non-traditional students. Much of the research on self-directed learning has been with graduate students (Landers, 1989; West & Bentley, 1989; Oddi, 1986). It will be helpful for administrators to gain more knowledge concerning undergraduate students and their level of self-direction.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study was to identify perceived differences in academic advisement needs between traditional and non-traditional students. In the course of the study, the following concerns were also addressed.

1. Overall perceived advisement effectiveness as compared among the three regional universities.
2. Differences in perceived advisement needs and how those needs are being met among the characteristics (A) age, (B) sex, (C) marital status,(D) full-time/part-time, and (E) those who responded to the first administration and those who responded to the second adminstration.
3. Possible correlation between age and self-directed learning as identified by the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (Oddi, 1986)

Null Hypotheses

Ho1. There will be no significant differences in the

perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between traditional students and non-traditional students.

Ho2. There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between students at the three regional universities involved.

Ho3. There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between those who responded to the first administration of the survey and those who responded to the second administration.

Ho4. There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between married and unmarried students.

Ho5. There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between males and females.

Ho6. There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between full-time students and part-time students.

Ho7. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between traditional and non-traditional students.

Ho8. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between traditional and non-traditional students.

Ho9. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between full-time and part-time students.

Ho10. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between full-time and part-time students.

Ho11. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey Academic Advising) between those who responded to the first administration of the survey compared to those who responded to the second administration.

Ho12. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between those who responded to the first administration of the survey compared to those who responded to the second administration.

Ho13. There will be no significant differences in responses

to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between males and females.

Ho14. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between males and females.

Ho15. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between married students and unmarried students.

Ho16. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between married and unmarried students.

Ho17. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between students at each of the three universities.

Ho18. There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between students at each of the three universities.

Ho19. There will be no significant differences in the total

mean responses to the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (OCLI) between traditional students and non-traditional students.

Ho20. There will be no significant differences in the total mean responses to OCLI between those students who responded to the first administration of the survey compared to those who responded to the second administration.

Ho21. There will be no significant differences in the total mean responses to the OCLI between the students responding from the three universities.

Significance of the Problem

Iovacchini, Hall, & Hengstler (1985) identified several differences between traditional and non-traditional college students. The authors emphasized the growing importance of non-traditional students to higher education. One of the areas addressed was that of differences in the perceived academic advisement needs between traditional and non-traditional students. This researcher will attempt to contribute to the store of knowledge relative to how traditional students differ from non-traditional students in their view of academic advisement. By making the comparison at three universities, the present study will not only identify differences between traditional and non-traditional students, but how these differences vary among similar institutions.

Srebnik (1988) recognized the importance of advisement assessment relative to student grades, student retention, facilitation of career and educational decisions made by students, and the positive influence of effective academic advisement on "...a student's academic and personal growth and satisfaction with his or her overall college experience" (p. 52). Since the assessment procedure is so important to college students, the author examined not only the over-all perception of advisement at the three universities but also the differences between traditional and non-traditional students.

Limitations

1. Because of various organismic variables such as the various differences in attitude, background, and experience of individual students, any difference identified cannot be attributed solely to the academic advisement program.
2. Since only undergraduates at public regional universities will be sampled, there can be no generalizations made beyond that population.

Definitions

1. Effectiveness of Advisement - The degree to which the advisement services within a university satisfies the needs of its students as reported on the ACT Advisement Survey (American College Testing, 1988).

2. Full-Time Students - For the purpose of this study, full-time students are those undergraduates who are currently taking 12 semester hours or more for credit.
3. Needs - The items and areas within the methods of advisement used which are identified by students as those essential to their continuance in and completion of their plan of study.
4. Non-Traditional Students - Students who are 26 years of age or older. (Weyden, 1987)
5. Self-Directed Continuing learners - Those individuals who initiate and persist in learning through various modes. Long (1989) said that the key factor in self-directed learning is "the degree to which the learner, or the self, maintains active control of the learning process.
6. Part-Time Students - Undergraduate students taking less than 12 hours for credit will be considered part-time students.
7. Regional Universities - The universities chosen for inclusion in the present study are Austin Peay State University, East Tennessee State University, and Middle Tennessee State University. The three universities chosen are under the jurisdiction of the Tennesee Board of Regents and are classified as Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I by the Carnegie Foundation (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1987).

8. Traditional Students - Those students who are 25 years of age and younger (Weyden, 1987).

Overview of the Study

A review of literature was conducted in the areas of non-traditional students, academic advisement, and the interaction between the two. A random sample of students attending each of the three universities was taken. The ACT Academic Advising Survey was administered to the students. The results of the survey were then analysed and recorded in Chapter 4. Conclusions and recommendations were reported in Chapter 5.

Organization of the Study

The study will be organized as follows:

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Chapter 2 - Review of Literature

Chapter 3 - Methodology

Chapter 4 - Presentation of Data

Chapter 5 - Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The review of literature and related research is presented in three major sections: (1) Higher Education, (2) Non-Traditional Students, and (3) Academic Advisement. Within each major area, various sub-topics will be discussed. This chapter will conclude with a summary of the literature review as it relates to the present study and a restatement of the hypotheses.

Higher Education

Higher education in America is different from higher education in other countries in several areas. Probably the most unique aspect of American higher education is its accessibility (Trow, 1988). A college or university education is much more accessible in this country than in most other countries (Glenny, 1988). Colleges and universities in this country vary greatly in size, from very small schools with enrollments between 100 and 200 students, to large universities with enrollments in the tens of thousands. The financing of higher education in America is also very diverse. Colleges and universities are financed by both the private and public sectors. The structure of higher educational facilities varies greatly in this country depending upon size, sponsorship, location, and purpose. This section contains sub-sections in which the history,

current trends, and various studies concerning higher education will be discussed. This section will include a summary of some major points concerning higher education in America.

History

The history of formal higher education in America began with the establishment of Harvard in 1639 (Grant-Roberson, 1988). In 1638 Reverend M. John Harvard left an endowment in an oral will to the college which was founded in 1636 in Cambridge, Massachusetts (Rudolph, 1962). On March 13, 1639 the Charter of Harvard College was authorized by the Massachusetts General Court. Since the major support for Harvard was from a Puritan minister, the first priority of the college was to train young men for the ministry. It seems appropriate that this country, which was settled, in part, because of religious freedom, would also have a system of higher education that was, itself, founded for religious reasons.

The establishment of Harvard was based upon the English model (Duryea, 1988). William and Mary was established in 1693 also on the basis of internal control within the institution by academics who were influenced by English universities. In 1701, Yale College was established. However, because of sectarian influence, there was a deviation from English tradition. This deviation was the establishment of an external governing board to help to

maintain religious orthodoxy. In 1763 President Clap of Yale made a statement to the colonial legislature that was to begin a trend away from another English tradition. Clap started a trend toward private autonomy of institutions which gendered support "of a judicial theory which interpreted charters to private corporations as contracts or compacts between the state and the founders" (p. 168). The culmination of this concept was the Dartmouth College decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the early 1800s, which "viewed the college as a private institution and interpreted its charter as a binding contract" (p. 169).

In 1837, Horace Mann (Rudolph, 1962) helped to establish the Massachusetts State Board of Education. Mann is credited with the establishment of the first public Normal School for the training of teachers in 1839. This was a major transition in American higher education. The Normal School represented a change from the private, church sponsored schools that existed mainly for the education of the clergy. Normal schools were the first step in the establishment of the public school system in this country (Rudolph, 1962). With the advent of normal schools, those who aspired to teach children could be properly trained beyond a grade school level. Many of the schools established as normal schools later became teachers colleges and eventually universities.

The period between the Revolutionary War and the Civil War was a time of tremendous growth in the higher education

system of this country. Trow (1988) wrote that of the 250 colleges that existing at the beginning of the Civil War, there are over 180 that survive at present. Trow also made the important comparison between the higher education system of America and that of Britain which had only four universities at that time. During the Civil War, higher education was de-emphasized as most of the resources of this country were diverted to the struggle between North and South (Rudolph, 1962).

The Morrill Land-Grant Acts of 1862 and 1890 gave American Higher Education a much-needed boost. These grants gave resources to the states with which to establish colleges and universities (Rudolph, 1962). Many Land-Grant Universities are now international leaders in various aspects of technology and education. In the period which followed the Civil War, a number of higher educational institutions, both public and private, were established. Many of the schools established during this period (Carter, 1986) were small, liberal arts colleges with a church affiliation. During this period, separate higher education systems were maintained for white and black students. Higher education during this period was very limited because of the limited number of high school graduates. The number in higher education was further limited by the financial ability of those who graduated from high school.

The period between the two World Wars was one of tremendous change in America. Baldwin (1987), in his

comments on the historical perspective of technological change, described this period as a very important one because of the discovery and development of electricity as a power source for industry. Baldwin also alluded to the contribution of higher education to the communication of technological advances and the development of new technology by the American higher education system during the period between the World Wars. It was during this period (Trow, 1988) that higher education began to develop relationships with industry, government, and other organizations. These relationships are credited by many as contributing to the success of higher education in this country. This period was one of the most diverse periods in our national history. It contained periods of prosperity that were unparalleled in our history and the "Great Depression". The higher education system mirrowed these severe fluctuations. The economic disaster of the Great Depression caused a drastic cut-back in the number of high school graduates. Therefore, the colleges in this country experienced an important decline in the late 1930s and early 1940s. As a result, colleges, as a whole, were ripe for the tremendous influx of students in the mid-1940s (Rudolph, 1962).

With the end of World War II, the higher education system in this country began a period of transition. Up until that time, a college education was accessible to only a privileged few. The typical profile of the majority of entering college students prior to 1945 was that of white,

middle to upper class, 17 and 18 year old students who entered college in the fall after graduation from high school the preceding spring (Rudolph, 1962). Those who comprised the "G.I. Bill Generation" were in a much better position to attend college than their parents (Buchanan, 1988). As Buchanan pointed out, the vast majority of the parents whose sons and daughters received benefits from the G.I. Bill were not high school graduates. Therefore, these parents could not avail themselves of higher education. As a result, not only did many of the ex-servicemen and women have the financial advantage of the G.I. Bill, they often had the urging of their parents, who, in many cases, had seen their education terminated in grade school or early high school. The capacities of the American higher education facilities were strained by the influx of returning veterans to their campuses.

Even though college campuses of the late 1940s and early 1950s were segregated, the returning G.I.'s probably contributed (Trow, 1988) ..." to a steady decline in hostility toward black people and a growing readiness on the part of whites to give blacks equal treatment and fair access to education, housing and jobs" (p. 14). The integration of many colleges in the late 1950s was the combination of various changes in higher education in this country that began with the return of World War II Veterans. These changes marked the transition that began a trend in higher education away from the almost exclusive domain of

traditional students.

Returning students of the "G.I.Bill Generation" began changes that were to eventually alter the face of higher education in this country . However, this was not their only contribution, as a generation, to American higher education. Rauch (1981) referred to the impact of the "Baby Boom" that resulted primarily from those who returned to civilian life after the Second World War. As the Baby Boomers came of age in the 1960s and 1970s, they put a great deal of pressure on the higher education facilities in this country. These Baby Boomers were more likely to graduate from high school and more likely to attend college than their parents (Levine & Havinghurst, 1984). The authors observed that by the peak in 1973, there were more than 4 million persons in this country aged 18. During the two decades of the 1960s and 1970s, higher education in America went through what was probably the most trying and diverse period.

During the mid to late 1960s, colleges were bombarded with numbers of students that necessitated rapid expansion of their facilities. However, by the end of the 1970s, this rapid expansion was almost reversed. Because of declining enrollment and adverse economic conditions many private schools were in severe financial difficulties and a few ceased to exist (Green & Levine, 1985).

Current Trends

Duryea (1988) observed that the American higher educational system has evolved into a system that is uniquely suited to the needs of this country. However, in order for a system as complex as this to be continually effective, it must be dynamic. The need for flexibility was pointed out by Green and Levine (1985). The authors observed that the 1980s brought a period of adversity for American Higher Education (Green & Levine, 1985). A very important trend was connected to the Baby Boomers mentioned earlier. Baby Boomers were having fewer children than their parents. The public school population began to decline in the late 1960s. Therefore, there were fewer high school graduates (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989a) as the 1980s began. Green and Levine (1985) spoke of the tremendous challenges that face higher educational administrators in the 1980s.

> Few faculty members or administrators are unaware of the diverse pressures now coming to bear on our colleges and universities. American society, slowly emerging from a serious recession, has become increasingly preoccupied with creating jobs and beating back foreign competition. The decline in the traditional college age population is just beginning to affect higher education.

> Not only are there fewer young people, but their values and interests are quite different from those of a decade ago. They are also less well prepared than their predecessors of decades past. (p. 1) McCorkle and Archibald (1982) indicated that probably the most critical of changed conditions that face higher education in this country, as we enter the present decade, is "the substantial reduction in the traditional college-age population and the impact it is having on enrollments and finances"(p.93).

Major concern for administrators is the preparation given high school students to enter college and the attitudes of entering college freshmen. Hoyle (1989) suggested that one solution to the problems in education in America is to combine the public school system with the university system. Many recognize the poor preparation some high school students are receiving as they anticipate attending college. Engen, Laing, & Maxey (1989), in a study of college-bound high school students, found that the qualifications of students for college showed little increase between the junior and senior years of the high school students surveyed. Therefore, preparation for college is very important in the years before the latter part of the junior year in high school. Another study (Lee & Ekstrom, 1987) indicated that there are inequities in the

availability of counseling for high school students who aspire to go to college. It was also stated in that article, that pre-college counseling might be inadequate, especially for certain groups in many areas. There are also concerns expressed (Astin, Green, & Korn, 1987; Chronicle of Higher Education, 1989) relative to the academic achievement of high school students as reflected in A.C.T. and S.A.T. college entrance exams.

The concern over the qualifications and preparation of those who enter college would seem to be justified when one considers the wide-spread establishment of remedial education in higher education institutions in this country. The Southern Regional Education Board (Abraham, (1988) collected information on remedial/developmental education in 404 public institutions in its 15 member states. This information indicated that "in almost 30 % of the institutions, at least half of their first-time freshman were in need of remedial instruction" (p. 3). Not only are there questions about the academic ability of many entering freshman, there are also concerns about the attitudes they bring to college. The American Council on Education (1988) discussed the changes in attitudes of college freshman as indicated by a survey they conducted of 1988 entering freshman. The results indicated that there are suggestions of "some decline in the overall emotional health of college freshman" (p. 1) and provided some indications of attitudinal changes that were affected by such factors as

increased depression and stress. There are also indications of disagreements and confusion about college in specific (Bowen, 1986) and general life goals.

The costs of a college education has been steadily increasing (Betterson, 1987). However, O'Keefe (1989) in a recent article stated that the increased costs have apparently not adversely affected higher education in the 1980s as much as previously predicted. O'Keefe stated the following:

> The reality of the 1980's, however, has delighted college presidents and frustrated the prognosticators. Enrollments have actually increased since 1979, in both the public and private sectors. Total enrollments rose from 11.3 million students in 1978 to 12.5 million in 1987. (p. 11)

As a result of the spiralling costs of college, various programs have been established for special groups. College education has been proposed as a possible solution in some cases of the underemployed and the unemployed (Grant, 1987; Meyer, 1987; & Baker, 1987). Halt and Tracey (1987) also offered higher education as a possible answer for welfare. Many schools are taking a look at marketing and financing as a result of the financial crunch (Kramer, 1989). Two such programs are at North Central College in Haperville, Illinois (Luze, 1984) and Maryville College in St. Louis,

Missouri (Karelis, 1989). Karelis raised the question "will students be enticed to take the liberal arts high road by charging them for the actual costs of goods and services they personally use versus splitting the check with students whose choices are more costly" (p. 22). Higher education administrators are also looking at fund raising, in addition to pricing to ease the financial pressure. A recent study by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989b) looked at voluntary funding as a possible answer to the financial difficulties facing some schools. Voluntary support is especially attractive to private institutions since fund raising and endowments are an intergal part of the financial plan of many private institutions. Another recent phenomenon in the support of higher education that has begun within the last three years is the concept of "Mega-Goal" fund raising campaigns (Worth, 1989). This concept was "started in 1987 when Stanford University announced a five-year fund-raising campaign for $1.1 billion (p. 18)."

As higher education moved into the 1980s, administrators found themselves faced with a number of challenges. The children of the Baby Boom, for the most part, had moved through the higher education system. They were having fewer children than their parents. This decline in birth rate eventually resulted in fewer college aged students. These administrators found themselves with an abundance of facilities and faculty, and in many cases,

with too few students. They were also faced with, in many cases, decreases in funding. As Green & Levine (1985) stated, this was certainly a time of adversity in higher education. At the beginning of the 1980s many who would have attended college were poorly prepared. This problem was addressed, in part, by the establishment of remedial classes in college. Administrators also met the challenges of the 1980s by special programs, innovations in fund raising, pricing, and by imaginative marketing programs.

Summary

From its beginning in 1639 with the establishment of Harvard, the American higher education system has become a large, unique, and internationally respected one. The first institution of higher education in this country was established on the bequest of a Puritan Minister for the purpose of training men for the ministry (Rudolph, 1962). While the first few colleges were established primarily to train ministers, higher education in this country has grown into a system that is very diverse in nature (Duryea, 1988).

Institutes of higher learning are faced with many changes from earlier times. The student body has changed from traditional students who were just recently out of high school. Many students on college campuses today are over 25, part-time, working, and/or commuting students. Because of a decline in traditional students, colleges are faced

with problems in using their facilities to optimal levels while taking into account the influx of non-traditional students. Students are also often less prepared for college than those in the past. The poor preparation of many college freshmen has generated an increase in developmental advisement and courses on many college campuses. The high cost of operation is also a problem for many institutions. This high cost is often coupled with a decrease in funding. As a result, higher education administrators are now faced with many complex decisions. In order to face the challenges of higher education, administrators are questioning the historical methods of academic advisement in light of the influx of non-traditional students as well as the changes that have taken place in college students as a whole.

Non-Traditional Students

Non-traditional students can probably best be defined in contrast to the traditional student population of higher education in this country. Iovacchini, Hall, and Hengstler (1985) examined the differences between traditional and non-traditional students in four specific areas (1) demographics; (2) motivation for higher education; (3) college plans and academic characteristics; and (4) perceptions of various university aspects. This study found various differences between the two groups in areas such as, availability of and barriers to higher education, commitment, financial considerations, study habits and

various attitudinal considerations. While adults constitute the majority of non-traditional students (Truskie, 1981) they are not the only non-traditional students on college campuses. During the course of this section, part-time students and self-directed learners will also be discussed, as well as comparisons made between these two groups and traditional students.

Adult Students

The age break of 26 and older is often used to define adult students (Weyden, 1987). It has been noted that there is a trend in this country for adults to either defer their college education immediately after high school or drop out of college before completion of their education (Fireside, 1986). Many of these people return to college as adults. In fact, the College Board (1989) reported that "enrollment of students over age 26 has more than doubled between 1970 and 1985 (p. 1)". The College Board also predicted in that same publication, that "by 1993, half of all college students will be age 26 and older" (p. 1).

Best (1987) summed up the importance of adult students to higher education by saying that the "implications are far-reaching. Students services need to be modified, approaches to teaching should be examined critically and questions arise about whether curricula should be modified (p. 7)". Jones & Petry (1984) used the Tennessee Attitude Toward Learning Scale to measure the attitude of 1,623 adult

students. The authors found adult students, especially those under 30, to be very respective of their instructors but very concerned about the commitment and dedication of those instructors. Weinrauch (1984) also alluded to the fact that adult students respect their instructors, for the most part, but prefer that those teaching them have experience in the area in which they are teaching. McCoy (1977) compared the adult developmental theories of several theorists such as Allport (1963), Kaplan (1976), Gould (1975), and Knowles (1970) to the considerations that should be made in the higher education of adult students. The author concluded that the study of adult developmental stages can provide educators with insight that might help in the development of educational programs for adults.

Much attention is now being directed toward the establishment of programs for adult learners in American higher education (Schlossberg, Lynch, & Chickering, 1988). Tifft (1988) listed several colleges that have established special programs for students 25 years old and older. Polson & Eriksen, (1988) described the attitudes of adult students toward various programs at 233 schools. This survey was conducted with the cooperation of The National Academic Advisement Association Task Force for advising adult learners. It included attitudes toward such programs as evening and week-end classes, distance learning, academic advisement, and various degree programs. Wayne, of the University of Akron, (Thall, 1987) recently developed a

comprehensive strategy for the recruitment and retention of adult students.

Self-Directed Learners

Malcolm Knowles is a recognized leader in adult and continuing education and is a former Executive Director of the Adult Education Association. He has been very active in researching adult education and is especially interested in the concept of self-directed learning. His book, Self-Directed Learning: A Guide for Learners and Teachers (1975) is recognized as one of the landmark works in self-directed learning. Knowles was a leader in the group of educators who recognized self-directed learning as an important force in higher education. This group began to realize, in the past few decades, that adult learners often exhibit more characteristics identified with characteristics of self-directed learners when compared with younger higher education students. This idea led to focus on the self-direction of adult learners in opposition to the historical concentration upon learning in higher education almost purely from the standpoint of instruction by faculty members. Knowles (1980) stated, "Out of this line of thinking came a new emphasis on education as a process of facilitating self-directed learning and a resource to self-directed learners" (p.3). Field (1989) spoke to the emphasis that has been placed on the concept of self-directed learning by pointing out that "While self-directed

learning has long been seen as an important component of adult education, during the past decade it has assumed a major role" (p. 125). Field conducted an in-depth analysis of the Guglielmino Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale, which is one of the scales that has been developed to assess self-direction in learning (Guglielmino, 1977). Henry, Bardo, and Bryson (1988) examined Holland's Self-Directed Search and used it to compare non-traditional premedical students. The authors found no significant differences in self-direction between groups of black and Caucasian students. However, there were significant differences between male and female students. Oddi (1986, 1987) developed another instrument to measure self-directed learning. The Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (OCLI) is a 24-item instrument designed to measure factors that are often associated with self-directed learning readiness.

Part-Time Students

As mentioned earlier herein, part-time students are fast becoming a very important segment in higher education in this country. The Carnegie Foundation (1986) called part-time college students "one of the fastest growing groups of students in the United States" (p. 1). The College Board (1989) signified the end of the habitation of college campuses by a majority of full-time students when they predicted that by 1993 "half of all college students will be studying part-time" (p. 1). Rogers, Gilleland, & Dixon,

(1988) noted the importance to higher education administrators of awareness of the motivational factors for part-time students in general and adult part-time students in particular. Another study (Derstine, 1988) compared anxiety in adult learners relative to a number of demographic factors, including part-time versus full-time attendance in a BSN program. This study concluded that part-time students who were employed part-time or full-time ran the risk of achieving lower grades in the program than those who attended full-time and were not employed. Baker (1987) alluded to the strong competing demands on the time of most part-time students such as jobs and/or families. Part-time students (McCartan, 1988), as well as other non-traditional students, have special needs in all areas of their college experience and especially in academic advisement.

Summary

As the number of traditional college students decreases, colleges are becoming more and more dependent upon non-traditional students. Most of those who predict future trends in higher education in this country project that non-traditional students will be the majority on college campuses by 1995. Those predictions are usually based soley upon the age of students. However, if other factors are taken into consideration, most college campuses are already populated by a majority of non-traditional students (Glenny, 1988). There are many students who are 25

years old or less who don't live on campus and those who attend only part-time. Many traditional-aged students work part-time or even full-time at jobs off-campus. Many students under 25 spend their entire college career as commuters. Many colleges are beginning to recognize that non-traditional students often have a different approach to learning than their traditional counter-parts (Buchanan, 1988). The concept of self-directed learning is a growing area of concern and research in higher education (Oddi, 1987). As the non-traditional student population continues to grow, it will be even more important for college administators to take the non-traditional student population into consideration in all areas, especially academic advisement.

Academic Advisement

Academic advising was defined by Tauer (1988) as "a professional service which provides accurate and effective delivery of academic information in an academic environment" (p. 48). She listed and briefly explained the five components of knowledge, attitude, belief, commitment, and skill that are involved in academic advisement. Academic advisement is generally accepted as a very important factor in higher education. The section on academic advisement will contain (1) History and Importance; (2) Freshmen; (3) Advisors; (4) Assessment; (5) Advising Adults; (6) The Future of Advisement; and (7) Summary.

History and Importance

Wall, was active in academic advisement at Penn State University from 1954 until his retirement as Director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) in 1986. He discussed his academic advisement experience in a series of three interviews in the NACADA [National Association of Counseling, Academic and Developmental Advisement] (NACADA)(1987,1988a, & 1988b).

Wall observed that academic advisement at Penn State and most other schools in the 1950s was "authoritative and directive" (p. 58). At that time, advisement left very little room for individuality within chosen programs and "there was little room for electives or for courses outside of the student's discipline" (p. 90). Most of the students of the 1950s at Penn State, like most other colleges, were respectful of the academic authority at college as they were respective of the authority of their parents and made few demands concerning their own educational needs. Students in the 1960s began to need a different form of advisement. The 1960s saw students in higher education who were beginning to question parental authority and authority of others, including academic advisors. By the 1970s academic advisement began to take on a much more student oriented nature. The protests and demonstrations of the 1970s emphasized the need for consideration in all areas of student rights, especially in the area of academic

advisement. The 1980s has seen a great deal of activity in the area of academic advisement. Wall mentioned the tremendous activity by the National Association of Counseling, Academic and Developmental Advisement in the 1980s as an example of the increased emphasis that has been placed upon academic advisement (NACADA, 1987). Habley (1988) suggested that, while academic advisement is recognized as very important at most colleges, it is still not getting a great deal of attention on a national level. Habley stated "It is highly probable that the proliferation of interest in academic advisement, growing since 1975, has yet to yield its most positive nation-wide outcomes" (p. 14).

Saleh (1988) spoke of the importance of academic advisement. "Academic advising constitutes one of the key problems facing higher education throughout the world today" (p. 46). Saleh looked at academic advisement from an international perspective. However, most of the material on academic advising, as referenced in that article, is based upon studies of American higher education. This would indicate that academic advisement in America is often used as a model for advisement in International Higher Education. Frank (1988) pointed out the improvements in academic advisement programs in this country in the past two decades. In addition to a discussion of advances in academic advisement programs in the past 20 years, Frank also gave several guidelines and suggestions as to the

establishment and development of advisement programs. The author emphasized not only the importance of on-going academic advisement, but also pointed out that it is very important to establish and develop advisement programs professionally and carefully.

Kramer, Taylor, Chynoweth, and Jensen (1987) addressed the question of academic advisement from a developmental point of view. The authors observed that, while academic advisement is very important relative to providing students with information, it is also important in career planning, teaching of decision-making skills, and providing the students with all the college resources available to them. The authors concluded that advisement is generally more effective if academic class differences are considered during the advisement process. Therefore, not only is academic advisement very important to the academic career of college students, it is, according to the authors, inter-related with and a very important part of the overall developmental process of college students.

While agreeing to the overall importance of academic advisement, Habley, and McCauley (1987) pointed out the need for the organization of advisement programs. The authors referred to the 1983 National Survey of Academic Advising given to 754 institutions. As a result of this survey, "organizational framework ranked second only to greater administrative recognition as the most pressing need in academic advising today" (p. 38). The authors presented

seven organizational models for advisement. The authors observed that the faculty-only model is the most prevalent at smaller institutions and that large institutions often use some form of a centralized advising system. The other five models are used much less often. The authors pointed out that, because of the diversity between institutions, it is important to look at models of advising other than the two most commonly used, especially in the development or revision of advising systems.

Janasiewicz (1988) in a study of 502 students who dropped out of college from 1983 to 1986 found indications of the importance of academic advisement in student retention. The author concluded that the results of this particular study indicated three broad categories of students who dropped out of college. The three models are Discouraged Student Model, Academic Model, and Financial Model. Janasiewicz suggested that academic advisement might be one way of identifying not only academic problems, but financial and institutional problems as well. He also suggested that coordination between academic advisors and other areas of the institution might help to not only improve advisement, but might be a factor in the retention of students. The idea of advisement and its relationship to retention is very important on a continuing basis. There are indications that the advisement of entering first year students at an institution build a very important foundation

upon which their continuing college career is built.

First Year Students

While the present study does not deal with first year students participation, as such, a great deal of concern has been generated in higher education in the past decade as to the level of preparedness of entering first year students (Patrick, Furlow, & Donovan, 1988). The authors emphasized the importance of advisement as it relates to college career progress. Since the subjects in the present study will be categorized by class, an effort will be made to determine if there is any correlation between freshmen and the other classes concerning their advisement needs. Earl (1988), in an article concerning first year advisement, pointed out the importance of and difficulty involved in the advisement of entering freshmen. Earl described a three point theoretical model of academic advisement for second semester freshmen who did poorly their first semester and were placed on probation. The author emphasized the importance of freshmen advisement.

Handel and Muratore (1988) in an article concerning the general education program at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), pointed out that entering freshmen are often vague or uncertain about educational goals. The authors suggested seven competencies that are very important for advisors to emphasize when counseling freshmen. They also offered an evaluation instrument to assess competency

levels of entering freshmen in critical analysis, scientific methods, qualitative problem solving, historical consciousness personal values and ethics, analytical reading, and writing. In a related study Japley, Kennedy, and Walleri (1987) pointed out that there are often inconsistencies in the advisement of freshmen or students who take remedial courses in order to obtain proficiency in the basis skills. This study involved the dean of students at 13 Oregon junior colleges. There were indications that "students with clearly identified deficiencies were still allowed to enroll in college-level courses that required use of the very skills they lacked" (p. 124). While this study was conducted only at community colleges, four-year colleges can benefit from this idea, as well. It is very important that freshmen advisement is coordinated so that, for example, a student who is taking a course to correct reading deficiencies can not take a course, during the same term, which requires college-level reading skills.

Because of the increasing numbers of students who reach college programs for which they are under prepared (Yanok, 1987; Francis, McDaniel, & Doyle, 1987; Hartley, 1987) increasing attention is being given to academic advisement programs for entering freshmen. One such program (Chambliss & Fago, 1987) was introduced at Ursinus College at the beginning of the 1982-83 academic year. Ursinus College is a private Liberal Arts College located 20 miles northeast of Philadelphia, Pa. Another program for the advisement of

entering freshmen (Dehn, 1987) was established during the 1984-85 academic year by St. Joseph's College in Rensselaer, Indiana. Six critical concerns relative to the advisement of freshmen were first identified. The total faculty of St. Joseph's was then involved "for a more inclusive and intrusive advising approach" (p. 66).

Several faculty workshops concerning freshmen advisement were held during the 1984-85 academic year. One of the results of these workshops was the formulation of an improved program for the advisement of freshmen during the 1985-86 academic year. Similar advisement programs for freshmen have been instituted at Boston College (Lonabocker 1987) and Illinois Benedictine College (Iaccino, 1987).

Advisement Process

At the beginning of this chapter, the importance of academic advisement was stressed. As in most programs of the nature of advising, the program is only as effective as the people who administer and implement it day by day. Therefore, it will be the purpose of this sub-section to examine the training, responsibility, resources, and roles of the academic advisor relative to the academic process. The National Academic Advisor Association (NACADA) was presented a report (Gordon, Swenson, Spencer, Kline, Bogenschutz, & Seeger, 1988) in October, 1987 from a NACADA Task Force on advising as a profession. A questionnaire was mailed to the total membership of NACADA, which was 1,000 at

that time. The questionnaire contained items concerning salaries, contracts, promotion and evaluation procedures, attitudes toward advising as a profession, training, certification, and qualifications of advisors. It is important, to note that, even though the purpose of the survey was consideration of academic advisement as a profession, the majority of the respondents were not full-time advisors. It is also important to note that the questionnaire was only sent to members of NACADA, an organization made up of academic advisors. Eighty-four percent of those responding considered advising as a profession. However, there was little agreement among the respondents concerning standards for professional advising.

Matthews and Ware (1988) also pointed out that, for the majority of advisors, advisement is only a part-time job. The authors added "...many colleges and universities provide their faculty with minimal information about advising limits and the amount of time that it can require" (p. 34). This article offered suggestions to promote the advisor's role in the four areas listed below.

(1) Preparation for the initial advisement session.

(2) Integration of course selection with career plans.

(3) Promoting collegial support.

(4) Serving as a surrogate parent.

Among the suggestions by Matthews and Ware was that materials and support should be provided to advisors in

order to help facilitate the advisement process. This idea was also proposed by Kelly (1988). Kelly suggested that an advising "tool kit" would be appropriate for most academic advisors. The author disagreed with the perception by some advisors that all that is needed for effective advisement is a copy of the school catalog. Danis (1988) referred to a handout given to students at Penn State. The handout, which concerns academic planning as a career strategy, and "is intended as a practical tool for academic advisors at all institutions of higher education regardless of size or scope" (p. 87).

The legal aspects of academic advisement are becoming much more evident (Nowicki, 1987) . The contractual relationship between the student and the institution should be one of the areas in which advisors are trained. This contractual relationship is between the student and the institution. However, advisors play a very important role in that relationship. Nowicki emphasized the importance of the advisor in this legal relationship. "Statements made by advisors create terms or promises the institution must keep if the student perceives the advise to be authoritative" (p. 85). The author also pointed out the importance of the advisor's being "familiar with the various state and federal statutes that affect student rights" (p. 85). Gehring (1987) pointed out the importance of the advisor in the legal relationship between colleges and students. He discussed the legal limitations on statements made by

advisors as the "agent" of the institution and outlined "the legal parameters that define the liability of an advisor for statements made in transmitting information to or about students" (p. 65). The four general areas of legal responsibility of advisors mentioned in this article were qualified privilege, invasion of privacy, letters of recommendation, and the contractual relationship.

The academic advisor has a responsibility to use the resources that the institution provides. He or she must be trained by the institution and maintain his or her advisement expertise and skill continually. Advisors are also often in a position where they must act as a buffer between the administration and the students. They must not only be aware of work done outside their school that might affect their work as advisors, they must also be familiar with the legal implications of their advisement. Compounding the pressure on many advisors is the fact that the majority of them have responsibilities other than just being an advisor. As a result of these and other factors there has developed the concept of "Advisor Burnout" (Murray, 1987). Murray gave a description of advisor burnout including its definition, causes, and prevention.

It is in the context of all the negative aspects of academic advisement that advisement, in some institutions, has taken on a less than attractive connotation. However, as pointed out by Arndt (1987) in spite of all the responsibility and problems associated with academic

advisement, there are very positive and rewarding aspects, as well. In this study surveys were sent to 77 academic advisement professionals. The purpose of the survey was to see how advisors see themselves as environmental change agents. The 33 advisors who responded "supported the premise that an academic advisor, especially a director/coordinator of advising, can have a positive impact on his or her campus as an environmental change agent for the benefit of students and faculty alike" (p.43). In a related article, Laff, Schein, and Allen (1987) suggested that advisors have an opportunity to effect change by challenging students in the advisement context. The authors challenged advisors to teach students "to learn to test their thinking for consistency and coherence. By making students use their cognitive abilities in their academic planning, advisors can also contribute to the overall growth and development of students" (p. 14).

Srebink (1988) expressed surprise at the lack of formal programs for the evaluation of academic advisement in most of the colleges in this country. To illustrate her point, she cited the National Survey of Academic Advising conducted by The American College Testing Program. The results of that survey completed in 1979 indicated "that approximately 75 percent of the responding institutions had no evaluation of their academic advising programs" (p. 52). A second survey, reported in 1983, indicated that 76% of the 754 institutions responding had no formal evaluation of their

advising programs. In a related article Vowell and Karst (1987) described the importance placed on the assessment of the advising program at Emporia State University. An intrusive advising program was instituted at Emporia State in 1984. In order to implement this program, the Student Advising Center (SAC) was established. Assessment of advising services that has been conducted by SAC has been very important in the administration and success of the intrusive advising program at Emporia State. The Quebec Educational System (Neale & Sidorenko, 1988) provided academic advisement for the approximately 5,000 students at their 44 member colleges in Canada. Assessment of advisement has been found to be very helpful to the advisement team of the Quebec Educational System.

Fielstein (1987) conducted an assessment of 90 students at the University of Arkansas. The questionnaire was completed by 38 of sophomores and 52 seniors. A majority of the students who participated indicated that their most important concern in advisement is that their advisor be personally acquainted with them. Andrews, Andrews, Long, and Henton (1987) surveyed 311 students who responded to an assessment questionnaire. There were 108 respondents from the lower division (freshmen and sophomores) and 203 from the upper division (juniors and seniors) of various colleges and universities. The two factors that the student perceived to be most important in advising were Information Needs and Personal Support Needs as measured by the Personal

Attributes Questionnaire. A study by McAnulty, O'Conner, and Sklare (1987) was conducted in 1983 at the Speed Scientific School of the University of Louisville. This study consisted of separate questionnaires given to the faculty and the students. Twenty-eight of the faculty members returned questionnaires and 328 students responded. The responses of the two groups were found to be rather consistent. However, advisors saw a need for more emphasis on their training, more release time for advisement, and an overall increase in the commitment by administrators to advisement. The students were, generally, very satisfied with the advisement given them.

Trombley (1984) conducted a study of 925 undergraduate students at the University of Vermont. A survey of 40 items was prepared to assess the students' perception of how effectively various advisement tasks were being carried out at the University of Vermont. As a result of a factor analysis, two general areas were identified as most important in the advisement process. These two broad areas are informational roles and counseling roles. Informational roles are those best represent the role that advisors have played, historically such as "providing information about university and community resources, making appointments for advising meetings, informing students about program requirements, and monitoring students' progress" (p. 234). Counseling involves areas of a much more complex nature, such as career, personal, and academic considerations.

Another study in the assessment of academic advisement (Winston, & Sandor, 1984) was conducted at the University of Georgia. Three hundred and six students from 10 schools and colleges of the university responded to survey. The Academic Advising Inventory was developed by use of a panel of experts. The experts were presented with 62 items, written in pairs. There were 22 pairs of randomly ordered items included in the instrument administered to the students. This study indicated that the students responding wanted advisement from a professional, competent, and informed advisor. However, they indicated that they wanted advisement to be a developmental process in which they participated and not a purely unilateral situation controlled completely by the advisor.

Academic advisement is generally accepted as a very important aspect of students' higher education. This importance is stressed by advisors, students, and administrators. The advisement process, as shown in this section, is not only a very important process, it is also a very complex one. This complexity is manifested in the legal, moral, and developmental aspects of advisement. As a result of this complexity, it is important to develop methods of assessment of the effectiveness of the advisement process not only from students viewpoint, but also from the perspective of faculty, advisors, and administrators. Once advisement programs are assessed, inadequacies and deficiences can be adressed. The advisement process should

be a very dynamic and important facet of each institution of higher education.

Advising Adults

The decline in the number of traditional aged students was discussed earlier. The College Board (1988) stated "The 18 to 24 year old age group will decrease 17 % by 1996" (p. 3). As the adult student population becomes more important to the colleges in this country, it will become more important to identify areas in which non-traditional differ from the traditional student population (Rogers, Gilleland, & Dixon, 1988). Toward this end, there has been much more interest in the past few years, especially by NACADA (College Board, 1988). The authors outlined various areas in which such differences occur, such as those shown below.

> Lack of information (or inaccurate information), lack of time, and cost are most often cited. Difficulties with transportation, obtaining child care, and geographical isolation are also deterrents. Psychosocial factors take a toll. Adults fear that they're too old to learn and can't compete with younger students or manage multiple life responsibilities. But adults also are quick to lose patience with bureaucratic inefficiencies and have expressed strong needs for

> special services ranging from designated reentry admissions counselors and orientations to their own lounge area. (p. 3)

Polson and Eriksen (1988) conducted a study concerning the special needs of adult students including academic advisement. Such areas as institutional support, existing services identification of "special groups and institutional barriers for adult students were assessed" (p. 9). One-third of the NACADA membership (439) were selected by a random sampling procedure. The authors commented "although academic advising is the student support service most frequently available to adult learners, there does appear to be some variability according to this item" (p. 15). This study indicated that in institutions where the overall environment was supportive of adult learners, much more time was spent advising adult students. There were also indications that "advising for adults occurs during evening hours" (p. 16) in institutions that emphasize adult learning and those institutions are much more likely to go off campus and make advisement available on week-ends than those institutions that do not emphasize adult learning. The authors indicated that adult students are very important to colleges in their marketing strategy and this growing student group should be viewed "as an integral part of the university environment" (p. 57).

In a study involving graduates of non-traditional degree programs at Southwest Texas State University from

1973 to 1985, Pierson and Springer (1988) made some observations concerning adult learners. Eight hundred, sixty-three graduates responded out of 3,154 graduates to whom the questionnaires were sent for a response rate of 27.4 %. The questionnaire, developed by the authors and reviewed by a panel of experts, showed a reliability coefficient of 0.9331 on the items included. The authors observed

> Although adult students are thought to be self-sufficient, academic counseling was still either very important or important to 72.8 percent of the respondents. Unfortunately, in some academic programs adults are sent to counselors who are unacquainted with an adult counseling model and are poorly skilled in relating to adults. (p. 21)

Future of Advisement

Habley (1988b), Associate Director of the ACT National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practice and former President and Treasurer of NACADA, listed three major challenges he sees in the future of academic advising. The first challenge is to find a way for administrators, advisors, faculty, and counselors to work together instead of at cross-purposes.

Secondly, a comprehensive definition of academic advisement should be formulated to include a broad, descriptive look at advisement. The third challenge is to

document the effectiveness and importance of advisement and to recognize the impact of advisement on college students and their future.

Polson and Gordon (1988) observed that the priorities for the future of advising haven't changed in the past few years, but the order of their importance has changed. In 1985 the authors sent the questionnaire that was used in 1980 to NACADA members. There were 600 usable responses from the 925 members. The results of the 1985 survey indicated a much different ordering of priorities for the future of advising. For example, the concept of computer-assisted information relative to advising was not included in answers given by the respondents to the 1980 survey. However, this area received the highest priority for future improvement of all areas mentioned in the 1985 survey. Abel (1988) suggested that, in the future, academic advisement should be expanded to cover the total development of the individual student. The idea of developmental advisement has been alluded to earlier in this chapter. Developmental advisement, not to be confused with remedial programs, is the concept of the advisor's helping counsel the student in their other life roles in addition to just academics. The two specific areas the author addressed are leadership and leisure. Able suggested that the inclusion of leadership and leisure advisement into the advising process might "be a means of developing a more holistic approach to advising" (p. 21). In another article on the concept of developmental

advising, Novels and Ender (1988) suggested that developmental advising can, perhaps, be applied in the future with specific populations in order to address their unique circumstances. The study involved 24 high-achieving minority students at a predominately white institution. The authors pointed out that this study can't be generalized to other institutions or other populations because of the small size of the cells and other considerations. However, they suggested that more work should be done in the area of the developmental advising of specific groups within the college student population. Advising special student populations was the topic of another article (Lopez, Younez, Clayton, & Thompson, 1988). This article explored the advisement "with a number of special student populations, including educationally disadvantaged students admitted through an alternative admissions program, minority students, learning disabled students and severely economically disadvantaged students" (p. 196). The authors suggested that more use of intrusive advising methods with such special student groups should be considered for the future. "Intrusive advising (Glennen, 1975; Glennen & Baxley, 1985; Glennen, Baxley, & Farren, 1985) requires that the advisor take an active role and seek contact with students rather than waiting for students, once in academic difficulty, to come to the advisor" (p. 337).

One of the areas that colleges in general and advising programs in particular are said to be weak in is the

application of computer technology. Kramer (1988) observed "Collegiate institutions have become technological laggards" (p. 3). Kramer presented the image of the advisor who advises "with a catalog in one hand and a ditto copy of college requirements in the other" (p. 3). The author suggests computer-assisted advising as the best method to be used in the future to provide advisors and students with accurate, up-to-date academic information. The future use of the computerization of academic advising programs was proposed by Bellenger and Bellenger (1987). The authors proposed the seven steps listed below as the basic components of a computerized advisement program.

(1) Proper atmosphere

(2) Participation

(3) Clarity of System

(4) Plan Scope

(5) New Challenges

(6) Reexamination of Performance Evaluation

(7) User Orientation

In the past two to three decades, the amount of distance education (courses taught off main campuses) in higher education has greatly increased. Beitz (1987) conducted a study of academic advisement of distance learners in a library and information science program at the University of South Carolina. She emphasized the importance of "a concerted, coordinated and planned program" (p. 283) of advising distance learners. Beitz stressed the need for

a face-to-face advisement session at the beginning of each student's program in which guidelines for the advisement relationship can be formulated. In another article on the distance learning, Paulet (1987) emphasized the importance of reliance on advisement through technology such as audiotapes, videotapes, telephone conferencing and computer teleconferences. Whether it be distance learning, intrusive advising, developmental advising or any combination of advisement strategies and concepts, the future of academic advisement is one of tremendous challenge and opportunity to college administrators and faculty.

Summary

Higher education in this country has envolved into a system that is often used as a bench-mark internationally. Even though the 1980s have been described as a decade of adversity (Green & Levine, 1985), higher education is alive and well in this country. Administrators and faculty members are involved in research and innovations in colleges on a scale that is unprecedented. Because of the decline in the number of traditional students who are attending college, much of this research has been directed toward non-traditional students. Non-traditional students, such as adults, and part-time students are filling the gap left by traditional students in such a manner that it is predicted that by the mid-nineties, non-traditional students will be the majority on our college campuses.

Academic advisement has received a great deal of attention by higher education administrators in the past two or three decades. Academic advisement has been shown to be very important based upon studies of administrators, faculty members and students. Studies have indicated differences in the advisement needs between traditional and non-traditional students (Pierson & Springer, 1988; Jones & Petry, 1984; and Weinrauch, 1984). Many advisement programs have not been reassessed since they were established at a time when traditional students were the vast majority. Therefore, it will become increasingly important for advising programs to be evaluated, assessed and realigned if needed to provide for maximum efficiency and effectiveness to all of the various student groups at each school.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to compare the perception of academic advisement needs between traditional and non-traditional students. The chapter is divided into five sections. The first section describes the population, sample and sampling method. The second section describes the research design. The third section contains a description of the ACT Survey of Academic Advisement and the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (OCLI). The fourth section discribes the materials and procedures. The fifth and final section discusses the methods of data analysis.

Population

The population of the present study included the undergraduate students who were registered and attending classes at the three regional comprehensive universities in Tennessee during the Fall Semester, 1990. The total population was 31,135 consisting of 5,971 at Austin Peay State University, 10,289 at East Tennessee State University and 14,865 at Middle Tennessee State University. The three universities included in the survey represented a fair geographic sampling of the students who attended the Tennessee regional universities. These students were not only drawn from the three geographical areas (East, Central, and West) of the state of Tennessee, but from neighboring

states, such as Kentucky, Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia. The demographic characteristics of the entire population of students at each of the three universities attending in Fall of 1990 was discussed for each institution and a summary is provided in Chapter 4.

Sample

A total of 1,400 names was drawn from the three universities, 400 from Austin Peay State University, 500 from East Tennessee State University, and 500 from Middle Tennessee State University on a random basis from the undergraduate student file of each university. The sample sizes were based upon the number needed, per university for a 95 % probability that the estimated proportion (sample) will be representative of the true proportion (population) (error range $\pm$ .05) (American College Testing Program, 1988, p.37). Certain demographic characteristics of the students who responded to the survey were compared with those characteristics of the students comprising the total undergraduate population at each university to determine if there were differences in age, gender, class status, full-time/part-time status, and marital status. Those comparisons were made using the Chi Square Goodness of fit test.

Sampling Method

A random sample stratified by university was taken from

the computer files of undergraduate students who were enrolled at each of the universities during the Fall, 1990 Semester. The sample was generated by staff members at each university as soon as possible after the close of registration for the Fall Semester, 1990. Personnel at each university used the computer software available to them to generate a simple random sample of undergraduate students. A computer print-out of the students in the sample at each university was then mailed to the researcher.

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to identify any perceived differences in advisement needs between traditional and non-traditional students at the three regional universities in Tennessee.

Descriptive survey research was used in the present study. The Survey of Academic Advising (American College Testing Program, 1988) was the instrument used. Also included in the survey was the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (see Appendix C). Since there are no sub-scales provided for in the survey, comparisons were made for each question. The mean response to each question was compared between traditional/non-traditional students, full-time/part-time students, students at the three universities, males/females, students of different races, and married/unmarried students. A comparison was also made of the total mean response to section VI of the survey which

included the 24 items of the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory.

Instrumentation

The instruments used were the Survey of Academic Advising published by the American College Testing Program (ACT) and the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (see Appendix C) which was included in section VI of the Survey (additional items section). The Survey of Academic Advising was developed by ACT to assess how students perceive academic advisement effectiveness in postsecondary institutions (American College Testing Program, 1988). The survey asked students to give their opinion as to how well their advisement needs were being met as well as the effectiveness of their advisor and various aspects of their relationship to their advisor. A section was also provided for additional advisement information such as how often there had been changes in advisors, how frequently the student met with advisors, and how long was the duration of advisor/student relationships.

Section I of the Survey of Academic Advising contained various items relative to the demographic characteristics of the students and is entitled "Background Information". Section II (Advising Information) contained four items concerning how the student perceived that the present advising system was meeting his or her needs, the position within the institution of their current advisor, how much

input the student had in the selection of his or her advisor, and how long the student has had his or her current advisor. Section III (Advisement Needs) contained 18 Likert-type items which were scored from a high of five for very satisfied to a low of one for very dissatisfied. Section IV (Impressions of Your Advisor) contained 36 items scored from a high of five for strongly agree to a low of one for strongly disagree. Section V (Additional Advising Information) contained five items. The items in section V of the survey were not considered in the present study. Section VI provided for up to 30 additional questions that could be added to the survey. The 24 items of the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (see Appendix C) were inserted into Section VI. Section VII, which provided for comments and suggestions, was not used in the present study.

M.J. Valiga (personal communication, July 2, 1991) indicated that plans had been made to conduct studies relative to the validity and reliability of the Survey of Academic Advising. However, it will be some time before these studies will be completed. Valiga further indicated that conventional methods, such as coeffeciant alpha, have not been conducted because the survey does not contain subscales that would lend themselves to such procedures.

The Survey of Academic Advising was one of 11 surveys developed by the ACT Evaluation/Survey Service (American College Testing Service, 1988). The Survey of Academic Advising was developed to assess students' impressions of

the academic advising services offered at specific institutions. The Survey of Academic Advising has been found to be a useful instrument by administrators in the approximately 125 postsecondary institutions where it has been administered to approximately 50,000 students since its development (M.J. Valiga, personal communication, January 13, 1992).

The Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (OCLI) (Oddi, 1986, 1987) was used to measure proactive drive, commitment to learning, and cognitive openness. These three factors were identified by Oddi during development of the instrument and were found to be characteristics of most self-directed learners in continuing education. The OCLI (see Appendix C) was made up of 24 Likert-type questions relative to the three factors identified above. These 24 questions were included in section VI of the survey in order to compare the total mean score between student groups, expecially between traditional and non-traditional students. The OCLI items were scored from a value of seven for "strongly agree" to a value of one for "strongly disagree" except for items 12,17,20,21, and 24 that are scored in reverse order (1 for "strongly agree" to 7 for "strongly disagree").

Oddi (1986) reported that when the OCLI was analysed for reliability, it "yielded an internal consistency (standardized coefficient alpha) of .875 and the test/retest reliability was .893" (p. 103). Six (1989) examined the reliability of the OCLI in relation to a study involving

undergraduate students and suggested that the factors obtained by Oddi (1984) "demonstrate robustness and applicability to a wider range of populations" (p.51) than the graduate students who comprised the Oddi study.

For the purpose of establishing validity, the scores on the OCLI were also correlated (r=.363) with scores on the Leisure Activity Scale, the Shipley Institute of Living scale (r=.265), and subscales of the Adjective Check List such as Self-Confidence (r=.551), Endurance (r=.539), and Affiliation (r=.265). The validity of the OCLI was questioned by West and Bentley (1989). They compared the OCLI and the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) among a group of public school teachers in 30 Tennessee schools and concluded that "it does not appear that either instrument is doing what the authors set out to do, in terms of prediction and screening" (p. 18). However, their sample consisted of public school teachers who were already college graduates.

The OCLI was chosen for inclusion because it has been found to be effective in identifying factors that are often associated with self-directed learners during studies envolving both graduate and undergraduate students (Landers, 1989; Six, 1989; Oddi, 1986).

Materials and Procedures

As soon as possible after the 14th day of the Fall Semester, 1990, which was the day after registration was

closed for the semester, each university provided the researcher with a listing of the random sample that was generated from their undergraduate student file. In addition to the listing, a set of mailing labels was also printed. The researcher used the mailing labels to send a letter (see Appendix A) to each of the students whose name was included in the sample listing notifying each student that he or she had been selected to participate in the survey. Each student was asked to participate in the study. Each student who agreed, was asked to return a portion of the letter indicating the specific administration of the survey the students planned to attend. The survey was conducted as shown below:

(1) Upon arrival at each of the three schools on Sunday, October 14, each investigator began calling each of the students who had not responded by mail. Each student contacted by phone who agreed to participate in the study was given an appointment for a specific time at which the survey was administrated.

(2) The survey was administered October 15 through October 19, 1990.
Times for the administration of the survey were selected to give equal opportunity for the various groups of students to attend.

(3) The person who administered the survey gave the following instructions:

First, I'd like to thank you for participating in this study comparing academic advisement perception between traditional and non-traditional students. The instrument being used is the Survey of Academic Advisement published by the American College Testing Service of Iowa City, Iowa. Please read the instructions and each question carefully. Section VI of the ACT Survey provides for additional questions. The 24 questions to be used for this purpose are those which comprise the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (provided under a royalty-free copyright license granted by Lorys F. Oddi) (see Appendix D). Please make sure you have a copy of the 24 questions before you begin. Please respond to the 24 questions for Section IV :

A - would agree most of the time (strongly agree)

B - would frequently agree (moderately agree)

C - would occasionally agree (slightly agree)

D - can't really agree or disagree with

the item (undecided)

E - would seldom agree

(slightly disagree)

F - would infrequently agree

(moderately disagree)

G - would almost never agree

(strongly disagree)

Use only a number two pencil. If you do not have one, raise your hand and one will be provided. When you have finished, return the booklet to me. Please make sure you have Signed and returned the Informed Consent Form (see Appendix E). The results of this study will be made available to the Academic Vice President who can be contacted for information concerning the results. Thanks again for your participation.

After the survey was given to the students who volunteered, the total number of students who responded was 331 or 24% of the 1400 students contained in the sample. The response rate for Austin Peay State University was 30% (n=122), for East Tennessee State University it was 11% (n=57), and for Middle Tennessee State University, it was 30% (n=152). Because of the poor response rate, a meeting of the advisory committee was held. It was the concensus of the committee that another attempt should be made to obtain a higher response rate. Therefore, a letter was sent to all

the students in the samples at each university who had not voluntarily participated (see appendix B). Those students (see Table 1 in Chapter 4 for the number of students who responded to the first administration of the survey) were sent an ACT Survey along with a return envelope. They were asked to complete the survey and return it to a box number provided at each of the three universities by Wednesday, November 21. On Thursday, November 22, by prior arrangement, the researcher traveled to each of the universities and picked up the completed surveys. These surveys were then coded in order for the results obtained from them to remain separated from the results of those given earlier so they could be separately identified when the results were tabulated. Those who responded initially were identified as first administration participants, while those who responded later were shown as second administration participants.

Data Analysis

The data collected were analysed for Ho2 and Ho21 by use of an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Data for Hol and Ho3 through Ho20 were analysed using *t* tests for independent samples. The .05 level of significance was used to determine rejection of the null hypothesis.

Chapter 4

Presentation of Data

Overview

The purpose of this study was to identify how the effectiveness of academic advisement is perceived by students at East Tennessee State University, Austin Peay State University, and Middle Tennessee State University. The perception of academic advisement effectiveness and continuing learning orientation was compared among the three universities and between various groupings of students: traditional versus non-traditional students and by gender, race, marital status, enrollment status, and the total mean response to the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (OCLI).

Comparison of the Two Administrations

As discussed in Chapter 3, there was not enough response to the initial administration of the survey. Therefore, a second administration was completed. After the results were analysed, significant differences were found in the mean response to various questions of the survey between those who responded on the first administration and those who responded on the second administration. The results of each administration of the survey were shown in Table 1. Also listed in Table 1 were the results for each administration listed by traditional and non-traditional students. As a

Table 1
Characteristics of Respondents

Category	Institution							
	Austin Peay		East Tenn.		Middle Tenn.		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1st Administration	122	68.0	57	53.0	152	76.0	331	68.0
2nd Administration	57	32.0	50	47.0	48	24.0	155	32..0
Total	179	100.0	107	100.0	200	100.0	486	100.0
① 1st/Trad:	90	74.0	33	85.0	108	71.0	259	78.0
② 1st/Non-Trad:	32	26.0	24	15.0	44	29.0	73	22.0
Total	122	100.0	57	100.0	152	100.0	331	100.0
③ 2nd/Trad:	36	63.0	28	56.0	43	90.0	109	70.0
④ 2nd/Non-Trad:	21	37.0	22	44.0	5	10.0	46	30.0
Total	57	100.0	50	100.0	48	100.0	155	100.0
Classification								
Freshmen	51	28.4	37	34.5	25	12.5	113	23.0
Sophomores	76	42.4	22	20.5	56	28.0	154	32.0
Juniors	27	15.1	26	24.5	38	19.0	91	19.0
Seniors	25	14.1	22	20.5	81	40.5	128	26.0
Total	179	100.0	107	100.0	200	100.0	486	100.0
Racial/Ethnic Group								
Afro/Amer./Black	28	16.0	5	5.0	18	9.0	51	10.0
Cauc./Amer./White	142	79.0	99	92.0	167	83.5	408	84.0
Other	9	5.0	3	3.0	15	7.5	27	6.0
Total	179	100.0	107	100.0	200	100.0	486	100.0
Gender								
Male	43	24.0	32	30.0	80	40.0	155	32.0
Female	136	76.0	75	70.0	120	60.0	331	68.0
Total	179	100.0	107	100.0	200	100.0	486	100.0
Marital Status								
Married & Separated	54	30.0	16	15.0	46	23.0	116	24.0
Unmarried	125	70.0	91	85.0	154	77.0	370	76.0
Total	179	100.0	107	100.0	200	100.0	486	100.0
Enrollment Status								
Full Time	159	89.0	98	92.0	187	93.5	444	91.0
Part Time	20	11.0	9	8.0	13	6.5	42	9.0
Total	179	100.0	107	100.0	200	100.0	486	100. 0
Grade Point Average								
A- to A	19	10.6	6	5.6	25	12.5	50	10.3
B to A-	44	24.6	28	26.2	58	29.0	130	26.8
B- to B	32	17.9	43	40.2	64	32.0	139	28.6
C to B-	45	25.1	20	18.7	34	17.0	99	20.4
C- to C	7	3.9	3	2.8	11	5.5	21	4.3
D to C-	2	1.1	1	0.9	0	0.0	3	0.6
Below D	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.5	1	0.2
No Response	30	16.8	6	5.6	7	3.5	43	8.8
Total	179	100.0	107	100.0	200	100.0	486	100.0

① Traditional Students (age 25 & under) who responded to first administration.
② Non-traditonal Students (age 26 & over) who responded to first administration.
③ Traditional Students (age 25 & under) who responded to second administration.
④ Non-traditonal Students (age 26 & over) who responded to second administration.

result of the differences between the first and second administration, results of each administration were analysed separately and listed separately. Specific differences between the students who responded to each of the two administrations are discussed later in this chapter.

Student Characteristics

The ACT Survey of Academic Advising was administered to a total of 486 students (33.2% of the 1400 included in the sample) at the three universities (see Table 1). The characteristics of the undergraduate student body at each of the universities during the Fall Semester, 1990 is presented in Table 2. Data were not included for the marital status or the employment status in the information provided by the three universities. After attempts to obtain this information, the researcher determined that the information was available only in a form that combined both graduate and undergraduate data (personal communication, C.W. Babb, R. D. Ikenberry, & L. B. Rudolph, May, 1991). Since this study did not include or request graduate student data, the available data were not useable.

Comparison of Sample and Population Characteristics

For the purpose of the study, traditional students were defined as those who are age 25 and under, while non-traditional students are defined as those who are age 26 and over (see Chapter 1). The only figures available for

Table 2

Population Characteristics

	Institution					
	Austin Peay		East Tenn.		Middle Tenn.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total Undergraduate Students Enrolled	5971	19.0	10289	33.0	14865	48.0
Gender						
Male	2705	45.3	4276	41.6	6864	46.2
Female	3266	54.7	6013	58.4	8001	53.8
Total	5971	100.0	10289	100.0	14865	100.0
Racial/Ethnic Group						
Afro-Am/Black	1075	18.0	319	3.1	1320	8.9
Caucasian-Am/White	4606	77.1	9476	92.1	13178	88.7
Other	290	4.9	494	4.8	367	2.4
Total	5971	100.0	10289	100.0	14865	100.0
Classification						
Freshmen	2699	45.2	3570	34.7	4891	32.9
Sophomores	1379	23.1	2418	23.5	3404	22.9
Juniors	937	15.7	1945	18.9	2943	19.8
Seniors	955	16.0	2356	22.9	3627	24.4
Total	5971	100.0	10289	100.0	14865	100.0
Enrollment Status						
Full Time	3669	61.4	7769	75.5	11233	75.6
Part Time	2302	38.6	2520	24.5	3632	24.4
Total	5971	100.0	10289	100.0	14865	100.0
Grade Point Average*						
0.00 to 0.49	66	1.1	(a) 154	1.5		
0.50 to 0.99	54	0.9	(b) 3272	31.8		
1.00 to 1.49	233	3.9	(c) 5443	52.9		
1.50 to 1.99	615	10.3	(d) 1245	12.1		
2.00 to 2.49	1445	24.2	(f) 175	1.7		
2.50 to 2.99	1535	25.7				
3.00 to 3.49	1248	20.9				
3.50 to 4.00	775	13.1				
Total	5971	100.0	10289	100.0		
Residence**						
On Campus	1100	18.4	2500	24.3		
Other	4871	81.6	7789	75.7		
Total	5971	100.0	10289	100.0		

* G.P.A. figures shown for E.T.S.U. are shown by letter grade equivalent.

** Figures given are approximate number.

traditional versus non-traditional student population as defined in Chapter 1 was from East Tennessee State University. Personnel at Middle Tennessee State University advised the researcher that statistics by age groups were not available for undergraduate students only. (personal communication, C.W. Babb, May, 1991). The figures received from Austin Peay University were in the age groups of 24 and under compared to 25 and over. A Chi Square Goodness of fit test was performed for the Austin Peay State University results even though the age groups differed between the sample and the population data provided. The obtained value of Chi Square was .895 with one degree of freedom (df) which indicated no significant differences between the population and the sample. The age groups received from East Tennessee State University were 25 and under (N=7840) compared to 26 and over (N=2449), which were the age groups used in the present study. Therefore, a Chi Square Goodness of fit test was performed using the data from East Tennessee State University. The obtained value of Chi Square was 1.27 with one degree of freedom (df) which indicated no significant difference between the age of the students in the sample and the age of the total population of students attending East Tennessee State University.

Traditional students (n= 364) made up 75% of the respondents while non-traditional students (n= 122) comprised 25% of the total number of those who responded to the survey. Table 1 provides a listing of the responses by

students at each university as well as traditional and non-traditional students. A Chi Square Goodness of fit test was performed to see if the gender, race, classification, or enrollment status of the respondents compared favorably to those same characteristics given for the total undergraduate population of the three universities. This test was performed to determine if any of the groups listed above were over-represented or under-represented among the students who participated in the survey.

Data on the respondents from each of the three universities are presented by gender, marital status, enrollment status, grade point average, racial/ethnic group, and classification in Table 1. Respondents at each institution were also listed in Table 1 by total number of respondents, traditional students/non-traditional students, and those who responded on the first administration compared to those who responded on the second administration. Also included in Table 1 was a listing of those who responded to the first and second administration further separated in groupings of traditional students compared to non-traditional students and listed by each university.

Females who participated in the survey made up 68% of the respondents, compared to the female undergraduate population of the three universities, 55.5%. The percentage of male respondents was 32% compared to 44.5% for the total undergraduate population of the three universities. Males were under-represented in the sample (χ^2 = 28. 37, df=1).

With regard to race, students who responded to the survey were apparently representative of the population. The Chi Square value of 3.53 (df=2) indicated that there were no significant differences between the proportional distribution of race of the respondents and the total population of the three universities.

There were significant differences found between the academic classification of the respondents and the population. A larger percentage of the respondents to the survey were sophomores as compared to the population and freshmen appeared to be under-represented (χ^2 = 30.96, df=3, p<001). Full-time students made up 91% of the respondents, while full-time students made up only 76% of the total population of the three universities. Therefore, full-time students were a significantly higher proportion of respondents than part-time students.

Perceived Advisement Effectiveness

Null hypothesis number one (Hol): There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between traditional students and non-traditional students. Question A of Section II of the survey asked: "How well does the academic advising system of this institution meet your needs?" The mean response to the question relating to satisfaction with advising was 3.17 by traditional students and 3.13 by non-traditional students (t=.34, df=472) (see Appendix F). There

was no significant difference and the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null hypothesis number two (Ho2): There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between students at the three regional universities involved. There was no significant difference found when an analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was performed (see Appendix G). The F value was 0.23 (df= 2, 474). Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null hypothesis number three (Ho3): There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between those who responded to the first administration of the survey and those who responded to the second administration. The mean response of those who responded on the first administration was 3.23 and was 3.13 for those who responded to the second administration (t=-1.03, df=475), (see Appendix K). Since no significant difference was found, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null hypothesis number four (Ho4): There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between married and unmarried students. The mean response to the question concerning satisfaction with academic advisement by unmarried students was 3.16, married students obtained a mean response of 3.19 (t=-0.18, df=471). Since there was no significant

difference found, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis number five (Ho5): There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between males and females. Males obtained a mean response of 3.20 and the mean response by females was 3.14 (t=0.57, df=472). Since no significant difference was found, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis number six (Ho6): There will be no significant differences in the perception of the overall effectiveness of advisement programs between full-time students and part-time students. The mean response by full-time students was 3.18, and part-time students obtained a mean response of 2.89 (t=1.73, df=471). Since there was no significant difference, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis number seven (Ho7): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between traditional and non-traditional students. Since the section relative to perception of academic advising needs (section III) contained no subscales, each question was analysed separately in the hypothesis testing process. No significant differences were found in any of the questions concerning perception of academic advising needs between traditional and non-traditional students, so the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Appendix L).

Null Hypothesis number eight (Ho8): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between traditional and non-traditional students. Since the section relative to impressions of advisor (section IV) contained no subscales, each question was analysed separately in the hypothesis testing process. Non-traditional students obtained a significantly higher mean score to question 1, question 11, and question 33 (see Table 3). The null hypothesis was rejected for questions 1, 11, and 33, but was not rejected for all the other questions in section IV (see Appendix L).

Table 3

Comparisons of Means of Traditional and Non-Traditional Students Regarding Impression of Advisors

	Traditional			Non-Traditional				
Item (Survey Question)	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD	df	t
My advisor knows who I am (IV-1)	330	3.51	1.36	100	3.91	1.30	428	2.59**
My advisor refers me if needed (IV-11)	303	3.44	1.09	94	3.70	1.20	395	2.00*
My advisor respects confidentiality (IV-33)	286	3.83	0.87	85	4.06	0.86	369	2.14*

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Null Hypothesis number nine (Ho9): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between full-time and part-time students. Full-time students obtained significantly

Table 4

Comparisons of Means of Part-Time and Full-Time Students Regarding Impression of Advisors

	Full-Time			Part-Time				
Item (Survey Question)	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD	df	t
Advisors help in scheduling registration (III-2)	348	3.84	1.04	19	2.95	1.18	365	3.63***
Advisors help in dropping/adding courses (III-3)	272	3.79	0.93	18	3.33	0.77	288	2.06*
Advisors help in obtaining financial aid (III-13)	182	3.38	1.99	10	2.50	0.97	190	2.74**
My advisor knows who I am (IV-1)	405	3.66	1.34	24	2.70	1.44	427	3.07***
My advisor is a good listener (IV-2)	401	3.92	0.97	25	3.52	0.12	424	1.98***
My advisor shows interest in me (IV-3)	394	3.59	1.15	24	3.00	1.22	416	2.45*
My advisor respects my opinions (IV-4)	394	3.86	0.93	25	3.36	1.15	417	2.57*
My advisor has an open & caring atomosphere (IV-6)	392	3.70	1.02	24	3.17	1.05	414	2.49*
My advisor respects my decisions (IV-8)	395	3.97	0.90	25	3.44	1.26	418	2.07*
My advisor gives me accurate information (IV-9)	395	3.74	1.12	24	3.17	1.27	417	2.41*
My advisor communicates changes (IV-10)	382	3.37	1.17	24	2.83	1.34	404	2.15*
My advisor refers me if needed (IV-11)	373	3.55	1.09	23	2.74	1.32	394	3.42***
My advisor encourages planning (IV-12)	384	3.76	1.02	24	3.13	1.30	406	2.90*
My advisor encourages me to achieve goals (IV-14)	387	3.84	1.01	24	3.17	1.20	409	3.15**
My advisor helps identify obstacles (IV-15)	364	3.54	1.06	25	2.96	1.21	387	2.65**
My advisor is punctual for our meetings (IV-17)	366	3.82	0.96	24	3.38	2.00	388	2.17*
My advisor is knowledgable about courses (IV-29)	373	3.51	1.06	23	3.04	1.02	394	2.07*
My advisor is approachable & easy to talk to (IV-31)	395	3.89	1.08	24	3.25	1.15	417	2.80**
My advisor shows concern (IV-32)	380	3.54	1.08	23	3.04	1.15	401	2.14*
My advisor respects confidentiality (IV-33)	350	3.91	0.86	20	3.50	1.00	368	2.03*
My advisor is flexible (IV-34)	389	3.77	0.95	24	3.21	1.10	411	2.80**
My advisor has a sense of humor (IV-35)	391	3.93	0.98	23	3.30	1.15	412	2.95**

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

higher mean responses than part-time students to questions 2,3,and 13 of section III (see Table 4). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for questions 2,3, and 13, but was not rejcted for all other questions in section III (see Appendix J).

Null Hypothesis number ten (Ho10): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between full-time and part-time students. Full-time students obtained significantly higher mean responses to various section IV questions than part-time students (see Table 4). Differences significant at the .05 level were found in the mean responses to question 3 (My advisor shows interest in me), question 4 (My advisor respects my opinions), question 6 (My advisor has an open and caring atmosphere), question 8 (My advisor respects my decisions), question 9 (My advisor gives me accurate information), question 10 (My advisor communicates changes), question 12 (My advisor encourages planning), question 17 (My advisor is punctual for our meetings), question 29 (My advisor is knowledgeable about courses), question 32 (My advisor shows concern) and question 33 (My advisor respects confidentiality). Differences significant at the .01 level were found to question 14 (My advisor encourages me to achieve goals), question 15 (My advisor helps identify obstacles), question 31 (My advisor is approachable and easy to talk to), question 34 (My advisor is flexible), and

question 35 (My advisor has a sense of humor). Differences significant at the .001 level were found to question 1 (My advisor know who I am), question 2 (My advisor is a good listener), and question 11 (My advisor refers me if needed). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for those section IV items listed above and shown in Table 4, but was not rejected for those items in section IV which were not listed above and in Table 4 (see Appendix J).

Null Hypothesis number eleven (Ho11): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between those who responded to the first administration of the survey compared to those who responded to the second administration. Significantly higher mean responses were made by second administration respondents to question 2 of section III concerning help by advisor given in the areas of scheduling and registration. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected in connection with question 2 and was not rejected relative to all other questions in section III (see Appendix K).

Null Hypothesis number twelve (Ho12): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between those who responded to the first administration of the survey compared to those who responded to the second administration. Second administration participants obtained significantly higher mean scores to

question 1, question 8, question 12, question 17, and question 35 (see Table 5). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for questions 1, 8, 12, 17 and 35, but was not rejected for other section IV questions (see Appendix K).

Table 5

Comparisons of Means of Those Who Responded to the First Administration and Those Who Responded to the Second Administration Regarding Impression of Advisors

	Administration							
	First Admin.			Second Admin.				
Item (Survey Question)	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD	df	t
Advisors help in scheduling/registration (III-2)	244	3.70	1.09	127	3.98	1.00	369	-2.44*
My advisor knows me (IV-1)	288	3.42	1.38	147	3.95	1.24	433	-3.91***
My advisor respects my decisions (IV-8)	282	3.87	0.99	144	4.07	0.80	424	-2.29*
My advisor encourages active planning (IV-12)	277	3.64	1.07	137	3.86	0.99	412	-2.00*
My advisor is punctual (IV-17)	261	3.70	0.97	135	3.96	0.94	394	-2.50*
My advisor has a sense of humor (IV-35)	275	3.82	1.04	144	4.03	0.94	417	-2.09*

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.
** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.
*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Null Hypothesis number thirteen (Ho13): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between males and females. No significant differences were found in the responses made by males and females to any questions in section III of the

survey. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Appendix H).

Null Hypothesis number fourteen (Ho14): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between males and females. Males obtained significantly higher mean responses than females to question 16, question 27, and question 28 (see Table 6). The null hypothesis was rejected for questions 16, 27, and 28, but was not rejected for other questions in section IV (see Appendix H).

Table 6

Comparisons of Means of Males and Females Regarding Impression of Advisors

	Gender							
	Males			Females				
Item (Survey Question)	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD	df	t
My advisor initiates meetings (IV-16)	133	3.13	1.21	270	2.85	1.22	401	2.14*
My advisor encourages extracurricular activities (IV-27)	130	3.31	1.13	234	3.02	1.02	362	2.47*
My advisor helps me explore career fields (IV-28)	136	3.54	0.99	252	3.16	1.12	386	3.36***

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Null Hypothesis number fifteen (Ho15): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between married students and unmarried students. No significant differences were found in

the responses made by married and unmarried students to any of the questions in section III of the survey. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Appendix I).

Null Hypothesis number sixteen (Ho16): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between married and unmarried students. The only significant difference found was to question 5 of section IV relating to advisor availability. The mean score by unmarried students was 3.71 (n=324) with a standard deviation of 1.06. The mean score for married students (n=103) was 3.42 with a standard deviation of 1.13. The *t* value for question IV-3 was 2.39 with 425 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected for question five, but not rejecteded for all other questions in section IV (see Appendix I).

Null Hypothesis number seventeen (Ho17): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs (section III, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between students at each of the three universities. There were no significant differences found among the responses made by students at each of the three universities to questions contained in section III of the survey. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Appendix G).

Null Hypothesis number eighteen (Ho18): There will be no significant differences in responses to questions

concerning impressions of advisors (section IV, of the ACT Survey of Academic Advising) between students at each of the three universities. Significant differences were found among the responses of students at the three universities to question 5, question 11, and question 16 (see Table 7). The null hypothesis was rejected relative to questions 5, 11, and 16, but was not rejected for all other questions in section IV (see Appendix G).

Table 7

Comparisons of Means of Among the Three Universities Regarding Impressions of Advisors

	Institution							
	Austin Peay		East Tennessee		Middle Tennessee			
Item (Survey Question)	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	df	F
My advisor is available when needed (IV-5)	3.80	153	3.74	91	3.46	188	2,429	4.57**
My advisor refers me if needed (IV-11)	3.61	148	3.18	83	3.53	171	2,399	4.18*
My advisor initiates meetings (IV-16)	3.13	148	2.72	86	2.88	174	2,405	3.42*

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (OCLI)

Null Hypothesis number nineteen (Ho19): There will be no significant differences in the total mean responses to the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (OCLI) between traditional students and non-traditional students. The OCLI consists of 24 Likert-type items. There were 453 students who responded to the OCLI sufficiently to obtain a total score. Thirty-

three of the respondents did not respond to the OCLI sufficiently for their responses to be included since they responded to only part or none of the 24 OCLI items. The mean response was 123.24. The range of responses was from 73 through 159. The standard deviation of the total responses to the OCLI was 13.9. Differences that were found to be significant at the .001 level were found between traditional students with a mean of 121.24 as compared to non-traditional students with a mean of 129.77,(t=-5.67,df=446). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Null Hypothesis number twenty (Ho20): There will be no significant differences in the total mean responses to OCLI between those students who responded to the first administration of the survey compared to those who responded to the second administration. Differences significant at the .05 level were found in the total responses of first administration participants with a mean of 122.06 while second administration participants obtained a mean of 125.66 (t=2.46,df=451). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Null hypothesis number twenty-one (Ho21): There will be no significant differences in the total mean responses to the OCLI between the students responding from the three universities. The total mean response from Austin Peay State University was 123.78 (n=148); from East Tennessee State University, 123.33; and Middle Tennessee State University, 122.80. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedure yielded a

F value of 0.21 with 2, 474 degrees of freedom. Since there were no significant differences between the three universities, the null hypothesis was not rejecteded.

Summary

The students who responded to the survey were found to be representative of the general population of undergraduate students at the three universities in race only. The only information available for traditional (age 25 and under) versus non-traditional students (age 26 and over) was from East Tennessee State University. However, there were significant differences between the respondents and the population in the areas of gender, classification, and enrollment status. Female students responded more frequently as did sophomores and full-time students. Therefore, there is a question as to the representativeness of the respondents to the population in these three areas.

There were no significant differences found in perceived advisement effectiveness by the various groups examined or by the students at the three universities. Non-traditional students expressed higher satisfaction with their advisors in the areas of referral to other sources, confidentiality, and personal acquaintance. Traditional students were generally more satisfied with academic advising, especially in the area of advisor availability, than non-traditional students. Males were more satisfied than females with help received from their advisor in the area of career exploration.

Unmarried students indicated more satisfaction with the availability of their advisor than married students.

The largest number of significant differences in perception of advisement as measured by Sections III and IV of the survey was in the enrollment status dichotomy of part-time versus full-time students (see Appendix M). Full-time students were more satisfied with the assistance given them by their advisor in scheduling, registration, dropping or adding courses, and obtaining financial aid. Full-time students also indicated a higher approval level of their advisor in the areas of personal acquaintance, being a good listener, interest shown, respect of student opinions, openess, caring, respect of student decisions, accuracy of information, communication, referrals to other sources, planning, help in educational goals, identification of obstacles, punctuality, knowledge of other courses, approachability, concern for the student, confidentiality, flexibility, and sense of humor.

Another area of interest to this study was the concept of self-directed learning. It is generally accepted that many individuals become more self-directed in their approach to learning as a result of maturation. Therefore, the results were examined to determine if the students who participated conform to the image of self-directed learners as being older, as a group, than those who are less self-directed. It was, indeed, indicated by the results that such was the case. Non-traditional students obtained a higher

total mean score on the OCLI than did traditional students.

The OCLI has been found to be a reliable measure of traits usually associated with self-directed learning in connection with undergraduate students (Six, 1989) and graduate students, (Oddi, 1984) as previously discussed in Chapter 3. The mean scores obtained to the OCLI was compared between students at the three participating universities and no significant differences were found. However, non-traditional students obtained a significantly higher mean score than traditional students. A significantly higher mean score to the OCLI was also found for those who completed the survey on the first administration when compared to the scores obtained by those who responded on the second administration.

Chapter 5

Discussion

This chapter presents a summary of the findings and conclusions made as a result of the study and offers suggestions for possible consideration in connection with advising systems as well as possible future research relative to academic advisement.

Summary

A total of 486 students completed the Survey of Academic Advisement at Austin Peay State University (n=179); East Tennessee State University (n=107); and Middle Tennessee State University (n=200). The results were analysed by use of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests for null hypotheses numbers two and twenty-one while *t* tests were used for the other hypotheses. Perception of academic advisement was compared between the students at each university as well as between traditional students and non-traditional students, full-time/part-time students, class level, marital status, and gender.

The Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (OCLI) was included as additional questions in Section VI of the survey. A total mean score was obtained and compared among students at the three universities and traditional/non-traditional students in order to determine if students in these groups exhibited any significant differences in the

characteristics of self-directed learners measured by the OCLI (see Chapter 3).

After completion of the sessions in which the survey was administered on the campus of each of the three universities, it was decided to make another attempt to obtain additional responses. As a result, there was a second administration of the survey. On the second administration, a letter was sent to students in the sample who did not respond to the first administration along with a copy of the survey and instructions for its completion. Those students were asked to complete the survey and return it by mail. Data from the surveys completed during the second administration were then compared with the data obtained from the first administration.

Findings

No significant differences were found in the overall perception of academic advisement (question II-A of the survey) between traditional and non-traditional students, full-time and part-time students, students who responded to the first administration of the survey and those who responded to the second administration, males and females, married students and unmarried students, and among students who responded from the three universities.

There were no significant differences in the responses to questions relative to academic advising needs (section III of the survey) made by traditional versus non-traditional

students. However, non-traditional students obtained a significantly higher mean score to the three questions in section IV of the survey (Impressions of Advisors) relative to how well the advisor knew him or her, referrals made by the advisor, and respect by the advisor for confidentality. Non-traditional students obtained a higher mean score on the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory (OCLI) than traditional students.

Significantly higher mean scores were obtained by full-time students when compared with part-time students to the questions relative to help with scheduling, registration, changing courses, and financial aid. Full-time students also received higher mean scores for various questions relative to their impressions of their advisors.

Students who responded to the second administration of the survey obtained a significantly higher mean score on the question concerning help by their advisor in the area of scheduling and registration. Second administration participants also obtained a significantly higher mean score on various questions relative to their impressions of their advisor. Second administration participants obtained a higher mean score on the OCLI than did first administration participants.

There were no significant differences between the responses of males versus females to questions concerning academic advising needs. However, males obtained a higher mean score than females to questions relative to the

initiation of meetings by their advisors, encouragement by their advisors in extracurricular activities, and help with career exploration.

No significant differences were found between the responses made by married students compared to unmarried students to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs. The only significant difference found to questions concerning impressions of advisors between married and unmarried students was that unmarried students obtained a higher mean score than married students in response to the question relating to advisor availability.

No significant differences were found between the responses made by students at each of the three universities to questions relating to perception of academic advising needs. Differences were found among the students at the three universities to questions regarding advisor availability, referrals by advisors, and the initiation of meetings on the part of the advisor. However, there was no pattern to the direction of responses from students at the three universities (see Table 7). There were no significant differences in the mean scores obtained by students at each of the three universities to the OCLI.

Conclusions

The groups surveyed, traditional and non-traditional students, full-time and part-time students, students who responded to the first administration of the survey and those

who responded to the second administration, males and females, married students and unmarried students, and students who responded from the three universities, were generally satisfied in their overall perception of academic advising. Question A of section II of the survey asked "How well does the academic advising system currently offered by this institution meet your needs?" This question was scored on a Likert-type basis with a value of one for "very poorly", a value of two for "less than adequately", a value of three for "adequately", a value of four for "more than adequately", and a value of five for "exceptionally well". The mean response of each of the groups mentioned above was over the "adequately" score of 3.00 (see Appendices G-M). However, significant differences were found between various groups relative to specific items contained in the survey.

It was generally assumed that as an individual matures, especially after graduating from high school, he or she begins to develop certain characteristics that enable him or her to obtain knowledge outside of the didactic teacher-student relationship (Six, 1989). Thus, there have been numerous attempts to identify characteristics of such more mature students and to more accurately examine facets of self-directed learners. Oddi (1986) obtained a mean response of 123.627 and a standard deviation of 19.026 in her initial study during the development of the OCLI in one such endeavor. A mean of 123.24 and a standard deviation of 13.9 were obtained during the present study from the responses by

participants to the OCLI. It is generally accepted that non-traditional students are more self-directed than traditional students. This was also found to be the case in the present study. Non-traditional students obtained a significantly higher score (mean=129.77) on the Oddi Self-Directed Learning Inventory (OCLI) than traditional students who obtained a mean of 121.24. This was consistent with the generally held idea that self-directed learning traits become more pronounced with maturation, as was also concluded in other studies (see Chapter 3) including the pilot study conducted when developing the OCLI (Oddi, 1986). The results of the present study also indicated that non-traditional students were more comfortable and better satisfied than traditional students in their individual relationship with their advisor.

As mentioned earlier in Chapter 2, student enrollment has increased drastically in public universities in the past 40-50 years. This is especially true in the case of part-time students. In the case of the three regional universities involved in the present study, many of the part-time students were commuting from other cities, some of whom had to make trips of several miles. Those students often attended only two or three days per week and many did not attend at all during normal business hours when various activities are normally conducted. The present study indicated that perhaps because of their limited access to advisors, part-time students were less satisfied with the help given them by their advisors.

Males who participated in this study expressed greater satisfication with the help given them by their advisor relating to their encouragement to participate in extracurricular activities, career exploration, and initiation of meetings by their advisors.

Married students responding to the survey indicated more difficulty obtaining access to their advisor than did unmarried students. This would indicate unmarried students were more likely to live on or near campus and more likely had schedules that corresponded with their advisors' schedules.

Recommendations

1. Academic advisement programs should be evaluated on a continuing basis at post-secondary institutions.
2. Efforts should be made to provide advisors at times and in locations that would be more accessable to non-traditional and part-time students.
3. Correlational studies should be conducted between perceived academic advisement satisfaction and institution characteristics such as size, private supported versus public supported, and school mission.
4. More studies should be conducted relative to a possible correlation between the student/advisor ratio and perceived academic advisement effectiveness.
5. It is suggested that further research be conducted as to the validity of the OCLI. There are differing opinions as to

the validity of the OCLI. Landers (1989) and Six (1989) were in agreement with the initial formulation of the OCLI in that it is a valid measurement of characteristics usually associated with self-directed learning. West and Bentley (1989) questioned the content validity of the OCLI. However, the present study would appear to point favorably toward predictive validity of the OCLI since significant differences were found between the higher mean response of non-traditional students as compared to traditional students.

6. Correlational studies should be conducted between self-directed learning characteristics and other hypothetical constructs such as self satisfaction, and various personality traits, as well as levels of accomplishment such as advanced degrees, success in college, occupational attainment, and personal endeavors.

REFERENCES

References

Abel, J. (1988). Developmental advising through life roles: Leisure and leadership. NACADA Journal, 8 (2), 17-22.

Abraham, A.A. (1988). Remedial education in college: How widespread is it? Issues in Higher Education. Atlanta, GA: Southern Education Board.

Allport, G. (1963). Pattern and growth in personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

American College Testing Program (1988). The Act evaluation/survey service user's guide. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Service.

American Council on Education (1988). 1988 freshmen survey results. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.

Andrews, M., Andrews, D., Long, E., & Henton, J. (1987). Student characteristics as predictors of perceived academic advising needs. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28 (1), 60-65.

Arndt, J. R. (1987). The academic advisor as environmental change agent. NACADA Journal, 7 (2), 43-46.

Astin, A.W., Green, K.C., & Korn, W.S. (1987). The American freshman: Twenty year trends. Los Angeles: American Council on Education.

Baker, M. (1987). Planning by four-year colleges to retain deserving part-time undergraduate students. Chattanooga, TN: University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Center for

Professional Career Enhancement.

Baldwin, S.E. (1987). Technology and employment policy (Report No. CE 048 783). Washington: National Commission For Employment Policy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 000)

Beitz, N.C. (1987)Academic advisement for distance education students. Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 27, 280-287.

Bellenger, J. E. & Bellenger, D. N. (1987). Guidelines for computerizing your information system for academic program counseling: Dealing with people problems. NASPA Journal, 24 (4), 53-60.

Best,L.W. (1987). Understanding adult learners: A faculty/staff development program. Kent, OH: Kent State University, Adult Services.

Betterson, D. (1987). How to pay for college 1988-89. Princeton, NJ: Peterson's.

Bowen,E. (November, 1986). What is college for? Time, 96.

Brown, J.V.E., & Robinson, R.D. (1988). The adult male undergraduate: Who stays and who leaves? College Student Journal, 22 (1), 95-100.

Buchanan, A. (1988). An emerging new group on campus. Lifelong Learning, 11 (5), 4-6.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (July/August, 1986). Part -timers: Myths and realities.

Change, 49-53.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989a). New strategies keep enrollments growing. Change, 21 (1), 39-42.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989b).The 1980s: A halcyon decade for voluntary support. Change, 21 (2), 29-35.

Carter, C.M. (1986) Are small liberal arts colleges selling out their liberal arts? College and University, 62 (1), 55-65.

Chambliss, C. A., & Fago, G. (1987). The Ursinus College freshman advising program. NACADA Journal, 7 (2), 20-22.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (1987, July 8). Carnegie Foundation's classification of more than 3,300 institutions of higher education. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 22-30.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (1989, May 10). Education secretary citing statistics, says school reforms have stalled. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A32-A33.

College Board (Feburary, 1988). National Academic Advisement Task Force surveys advisement of adult learners. OALS Network News, 3-4.

College Board (1989). Adults as students: Their status and role in higher education. Washington: College Board.

Danis, E. J. (1988). Academic planning as a career strategy. NACADA Journal, 7 (1), 87-88.

Dean, G.J., Eriksen, J.P., & Lindamood, S.A. (1987). Adults in mid-career change: Case studies for advisors NACADA Journal, 7 (1), 16-26.

Dehn, S. (1987). Using faculty to advise new students. NACADA Journal, 7 (1), 62-66.

Derstine, J. B. (August/September, 1988). Anxiety in the adult learner in an RN to BSN program: Real or imagined. Health Education, 13-15.

Duryea, D. (Ed.). (1988). ASHE reader on organizations and government in higher education. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press, 165-182.

Earl, W. R. (1988). Intrusive advising of freshmen in academic difficulty. NACADA Journal, 8 (2), 27-33.

Engen, H., Laing, J., & Maxey, J. (1989). Changes in college bound students' self-reported information between their junior and senior years. College and University, 64, 159-168.

Field, L. (1989). An investigation into the structure, validity reliability of Guglielmino's self-directed learning readiness scale. Adult Education Quarterly, 39, 125-139.

Fielstein, L. L. (1987). Student preferences for personal contact in a student-faculty advising relationship. NACADA Journal, 7 (2), 34-40.

Fireside, B. (1986, April). Should you put your college education on hold? Seventeen, pp.112-113.

Francis, K. C., Mc Daniel, M., & Doyle, R. E. (1987).

Training in role communication skills: Effect on interpersonal and academic skills of high-risk freshmen. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28 (2), 151-156.

Frank, C. P. (1988). The development of academic advisement programs: Validating a valid model. NACADA Journal, 8 (1), 11- 28.

Gehring, D. D. (1987). The legal limitations on statements made by advisors. NACADA Journal, 7 (2), 64-68.

Glennen, R. E. (1975). Intrusive college counseling. College Student Journal, 9, 335-338.

Glennen, R. E., & Baxley, D. M. (1985) Reduction of attrition through intrusive advising. NASPA Journal, 22 (3), 10-14.

Glennen, R. E., Baxley, D.M., & Farren, P. J. (1985). Impact of intrusive advising on minority student retention. College Student Journal, 19, 335-338.

Glenny, L.A. (Ed.). (1988). ASHE reader on organization and governance in higher education. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press. 358-372.

Gordon, V. N., Swenson, R. W., Spencer, L. V., Kline, D. I., Bogenschutz, M., & Seeger, B. (1988). Advising as a profession. NACADA Journal, 8 (2), 59-64.

Gould, R. (1975, July). Adult life stages: Growth toward self-tolerance. Psychology today, p.78.

Grant, C. D. (1987). Opportunities through education. Duluth, MN: St. Scholastica College, Encore Program.

Grant-Roberson, G. (1988). Libraries and adult education: An historical view. Lifelong Learning, 12 (2), 15-17.

Green, J. S., & Levine, A. (1985). Opportunity in adversity. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Guglielmino, L. M. (1977). Development of the self-directed learning readiness scale. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 64-67A.

Habley, W.R., & Crockett, D.S. (1988). The third ACT national survey of academic advising. The status and future of academic advising: Problems and promise. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Service.

Habley, W. R. (1988a). The status and future of academic advisement: Problems & promise. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Service.

Habley, W. R. (1988b). Carpe diem: A look at the future of NACADA and advising. NACADA Journal, 8 (1), 85-88.

Habley, W. R., & McCauley, M.E. (1987). The relationship between institutional characteristics and the organization of advising services. NACADA Journal, 7 (1), 27-39.

Halt, R. C., & Tracey, R. (1987). Lessons for a welfare-adult school partnership. Ventura, CA: Ventura Unified School District, Adult/Continuing Education.

Handel, S. J., & Muratore, J. C. (1988). A counseling service's review of a general education curriculum. NACADA Journal, 8 (1), 63-71.

Hartley, M. P. (1987) H.E.L.P. for students: One university's action approach to increasing student retention. College and University, 63 (1), 80-94.

Henry, P., Bardo, H., & Bryson, S. (1988). The impact of race and gender on Holland's search for nontraditional premedical students. College Student Journal, 22 (2), 206-212.

Holtzclaw, L.R. (1988). Flexible admission practices for adult learners. Lifelong Learning, 11 (6), 9-11.

Hoyle, J. R. (1989). Uniting university and public school systems: Will this solve America's education problems? The School Administrator, 46 (4), 9-18.

Iaccino, J. (1987). Developing an effective delivery system. The freshman advising program. NACADA Journal, 7 (2), 41-42.

Iovacchini, E.V., Hall, L.M., & Hengstler, D.D. (1985). Going back to college: Some differences between adult students and traditional students. College and University, 61 (1), 43-55.

Janasiewicz, B. A. (1988). Campus leaving behavior. NACADA Journal, 7 (2), 23-30.

Japely, S. M., Kennedy, M. J., & Walleri, R. D. (1987). Assisting success through an improved student information system. College and University, 62 (2), 117-125.

Jones, P. L. & Petry, J. R. (1984) Attitudes of adult basic education students toward education and their teachers. The Clearing House, 57, 213-216.

Kaplan, M. (1976). The ideologies of tough times. Change, 8 (8) 9.

Karelis, C. (1989). Price as a lever for reform. Change, 21 (2), 21-28.

Kelly, J. J. (1988). Developing the advising "tool kit." NACADA Journal, 8 (2), 81-84.

Knowles, M. (1970). The modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy: New York: Cambridge.

Knowles, M. (1975). Self-directed learning: A guide for learners and teachers. New York: Cambridge.

Knowles, M. (1980). The modern practice of adult education. New York: Cambridge.

Kramer, G. L. (1988). Enhancing the role of academic advising on the college campus. NACADA Journal, 8 (1), 3-6.

Kramer, G. L., Taylor, L., Chynoweth, B., & Jensen, J. (1987). Developmental academic advising: A taxonomy of services. NASPA Journal, 24 (4), 23-31.

Kramer, M. (1989). Caught in the web: The agenda of enrollments, costs and student aid. Change, 21 (2), 8.

Laff, N. S., Schein, H. K., &, Allen, D. R. (1987). Teaching, advising and student development: Finding the common ground. NACADA Journal, 7 (1), 9-15.

Landers, K. (1989). Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory: A new measure for self-directed learners. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY.

Lee, V. E., & Ekstrom, R. B. (1987) Student access to guidance counseling in high school. American Educational Research Journal, 24, 287-309.

Levine, D. U., & Havighurst, R. J. (1984) Society and Education (6th ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Lonabocker, L. (1987). Freshman registration and advisement. College and University, 62, 341-344.

Long, H. B. (1989). Self-directed learning: Emerging theory and practice. (1-11). Norman: OK; Oklahoma Research Center for Continuing Professional and Higher Education of the University of Oklahoma.

Lopez, M., Younez, M., Clayton, E. R., & Thompson, D. A. (1988). Intrusive advising with special student populations, NASPA Journal, 25, 195-201.

Luze, R. J. (April, 1984). College marketing. Two success stories. A S & U, 48e-48h.

Lynch, A.Q., Doyle, R.J., & Chickering, A.W. (1985). Model programs for adult learners in higher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 713-716.

Matthews, J. R., & Ware, M. E. (1988). Promoting the advisor's role. College Teaching, 36 (1), 34-36.

McAnulty, B., O'Conner, C., & Sklare, L. (1987). Analysis

of student and faculty opinion of academic advising services. NACADA Journal, 7 (1), 49-61

McCartan, A. M. (1988). Students who work: Are they paying too high a price? Change, 20 (5), 11-20.

McCorkle, C. O., & Archibald, S. O. (1982). Management and leadership in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCoy, V. R. (October, 1977). Adult life cycle change. Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 14-19.

Meyer, M. K. (1987). Tuition grant program for the unemployed. Mount St. Joseph, Mo.: College of Mount St. Joseph, Division of Continuing Education.

Murray, G. L. (1987). The advisor under stress: Fired up or burned out? NACADA Journal, 7 (2), 47-53.

National Association of Counseling, Academics and Developmental Advisement. (1987). Personal perspectives on the history of academic advising. Part I. NACADA Journal, 7 (2), 57-63.

National Association of Counseling, Academics and Developmental Advisement. (1988a). Personal perspectives on the history of academic advising: Part II. NACADA Journal, 8 (1), 89-95.

National Association of Counseling, Academics and Developmental Advisement. (1988b). Personal perspectives on the history of academic advisement: Part III. NACADA Journal, 8 (2), 65-76.

Neale, A., & Sidorenko, C. (1988). Student evaluation: A

model for improving advising services. NACADA Journal, 8 (1), 72-82.

Novels, A. N., & Ender, S. C. (1988). The impact of developmental advising for high-achieving minority student. NACADA Journal, 8 (2), 23-26.

Nowicki, M. (1987). Legal implications of academic advising. NACADA Journal, 7 (1), 83-86.

Oddi, L. S. (1986). Development and validation of an instrument to identify self-directed continuing learners. Adult Education Quarterly, 36 (2), 97-107.

Oddi, L. S. (1987). Perspectives on self-directed learning Adult Education Quarterly, 38 (1), 21-31.

O'Keefe (1989). Private colleges: Beating the odds. Change, 21 (2), 11-19.

Patrick, J., Furlow, J. W., & Donovan, S. (1988). Using a comprehensive academic intervention program in the retention of high-risk students. NACADA Journal, 8 (1), 29-34.

Paulet, R. (1987). Counseling distance learners. Tech Trends, 32 (4), 26-28.

Pierson, M.J., & Springer, S.B. (1988). Can anything good come from non-traditional degree programs? Lifelong Learning, 11, 20-24.

Polson, C.J., & Ericksen (1988). The impact of administrative support and institutional type on adult learner services. NACADA Journal, 8 (2), 7-16.

Polson, C. J., & Gordon, V. N. (1988). Issues in academic

advising revisited. NACADA Journal, 8 (2), 49-58.

Rauch, D.B. (September 1981). Education for the growing majority: Adults. Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 10-13.

Rogers, K. R., Gilleland, K. R., & Dixon, G. (1988). Educational motivations of part-time adults as related to socio-demographic variables. College & University, 63 (2), 198-209.

Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university. New York: Random House.

Saleh, M. A. (1988). An international perspective on academic advising: A report from students at a university in Saudi Arabia. NACADA Journal, 8 (1), 46-51.

Schlossberg, N. K., Lynch, A. Q., & Chickering, A. W. (1988). Improving higher education environments for adults. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shere, C. (1988). Who is the adult learner? Journal of College Admissions, 121, 18-27.

Six, J. E. (1989). The generality of the underlying dimensions of the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory. Adult Education Quarterly, 40 (1), 43-51.

Srebnik, D.S. (1988). Academic advising evaluation: A review of assessment instruments. NACADA Journal, 8 (1), 52-62.

Tauer, C. A. (1988). A brief attempt at defining academic advisement. NACADA Journal, 8 (2), 48.

Thall, H. (1987). Facilitating adult enrollment:

Recruitment strategies to overcome barriers. Orrville, OH: University of Akron, Wayne College.

Tifft, S. (October, 1988) The over-25 set moves in. Time, 90.

Trombley, T. B. (1984). An analysis of the complexity of advising tasks. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 234-239.

Trow, M. (1988). American higher education: Past, present and future. Educational Researcher, 17, 13-23.

Truskie, S.D. (September 1981). Emerging trends in adult education: Implications for management development. Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 14-15.

Valiga, M.J. (personal communication, Jun 20, 1991.)

Vowell, F., & Karst, R. (1987). Student satisfaction with faculty advisors in an intrusive advising program. NACADA Journal, 7 (2), 31-33.

Warner, A.S. (1985).. A first for continuing education. Library Journal, 110, 39-41.

Weinrauch, J. D. (April, 1984). Educating the entrepreneur: Understanding adult learning behavior. Journal of Small Business Management , 22 (2) 32-37.

Werring, C. J. (1987). Responding to the older aged full-time student: Preferences for undergraduate education. College Student Affairs Journal, 7 (11), 13-20.

West, R.F., & Bentley, E.L. (1989, February). Relationships between scores on the Self Directed Learning Readiness Scale, Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory and

participation in professional education. Paper presented at the American Symposium on Adult Self-Directed learning. Oklahoma Research Center for Continuing Professional and Higher Education. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma.

Weyden, J. V. (1987). Nontraditional students on campus at Western Michigan University: Survey results and implications for the future. Kalamazoo, Mich: Western Michigan University, Evening and Week-End Programs.

Winston, R. B., & Sandor, J. A. (1984). Developmental academic advising: What do students want? NACADA Journal, 4 (1), 5-13.

Worth, M. J. (1989). The challenge of mega-goal campaigns. AGB Reports, 31 (2), 18-22.

Yanok, J. (1987). Transforming developmental education for learning disabled students. College and University, 63 (1), 70-79.

Zemke, R., & Zemke, S. (July 1981). Thirty things we know for sure about adult learning. Training, 57 - 61.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Letter to Students

Appendix A

Dear Student:

You have been selected to participate in a study which is designed to contribute to the store of knowledge concerning the academic advisement program at E.T.S.U.

On October 15, 16, and 17, the American College Testing Service (ACT) Survey of Academic Advisement will be given in meeting room No. 3 on the third floor of the D.P. Culp Center. The schedule for the administration is listed below and on the back of this letter.

If you agree to participate, please indicate which session you plan to attend on the form shown below. For your information and to remind you when to complete the survey, also mark the time you plan to attend on the upper portion of the back of this letter. After you have filled in the form below, sign it, detach it from this letter and put it in the campus mail.

Your participation is very important to the success of this study. It will take approximately twenty (20) minutes for you to complete the survey. All information will be kept strictly confidential. Here is your change to voice your opinion of the effectiveness of the E.T.S.U. academic advisement program on an anonimous basis. This is also an opportunity to offer suggestions as to changes which might be considered by administrative personnel.

Thank you for your participation.

Jim Daniel

.....

Name:_____S.S.No.:_____

I will attend the session which is checked below:

MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1990
( ) 9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
( ) 2:00 - 5:00 p.m.
( ) 7:00 - 9:00 p.m.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1990
( ) 9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
( ) 2:00 - 5:00 p.m.
( ) 7:00 - 9:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1990
( ) 9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
( ) 2:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Don't forget to attend the Session to take the ACT Survey

(Check One)

MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1990
( ) 9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
( ) 2:00 - 5:00 p.m.
( ) 7:00 - 9:00 p.m.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1990
( ) 9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
( ) 2:00 - 5:00 p.m.
( ) 7:00 - 9:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1990
( ) 9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
( ) 2:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Jim Daniel
Educational Leadership
Box 19000 A
East Tennessee State University

Appendix B

Second Mailing to Students

Appendix B

November 6, 1990

Dear Student:

You recently received a letter from Jim Daniel asking you to make an appointment to take the American College Testing (ACT) Survey of Academic Advisement. This is certainly a busy time and I can understand why you were unable to make an appointment. Therefore, enclosed is an ACT survey. Perhaps it would be easier for you to take twenty minutes of your time and complete the survey at your convenience.

The completion of this survey is an important opportunity for you to voice your opinion of the advisement program at this school. Whatever your opinion, good or bad, or if you feel you are not familiar with academic advisement, your input is most important.

The results of the academic advisement surveys will be given to the Academic Vice-President. This data will not be discarded, but will be used to evaluate the academic advisement program. The primary purpose of this study is to offer data which will improve the academic advisement program at this school.

The results will be compiled on a confidential basis. There is no way you can be identified once the survey results have been compiled. Please read the enclosed instructions, fill out the survey with a number 2 pencil and return it along with a signed informed consent form in the enclosed envelope via campus mail.

Your help in giving your ideas about this important area of your college education is appreciated. Please put the completed survey and informed consent in the campus mail by Wednesday, November 21.

Sincerely,

Dr. Linda Rudolph
Austin-Peay State University

Appendix C

Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory

Appendix D

Letter to Dr. Oddi

June 19, 1989

Dr. Lorys F. Oddi, Associate Professor
Northern Illinois University
Dekalb, IL 60115

Rt. 7, Box 384
Jonesborough, TN
37659

Dear Dr. Oddi:

I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University (ETSU) in Johnson City, TN. I hope to receive an Ed.D in post-secondary administration in May of 1990. The proposed title of my dissertation is "Comparison of Advisement Needs Between Traditional and Non-traditional Students at the Five Tennessee Comprehensive Universities". The instrument to be used for the study is the ACT survey of Academic Advisement. This survey has a section in which 30 questions can be inserted for each administration. With your permission I would like to use the Oddi Contining Learning Inventory (OCLI) in that section.

Have any studies been conducted using the OCLI in which a correlational coefficient has been computed between age and OCLI scores? I am especially interested in whether or not there are any indications how people become self-directed learners. Are they born that way, is it a process of maturation or is it a personality trait?

Dr. Oddi, I will certainly appreciate any help you can give me as I work on the dissertation.

Sincerely,

Jim Daniel

Appendix E

Informed Consent Form

Appendix E

FORM NO. 106

East Tennessee State University
Institutional Review Board
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James L. Daniel

TITLE OF PROJECT: Advisement Effectiveness and Self-Directed Learning: A Comparison Between Traditional and Non-Traditional Students in Selected Regional Universities in Tennessee.

1) Indicated below are the (a) purpose of this study, (b) the procedures to be followed, and (c) the approximate duration of this study: (2) To compare perceptions of academic advisement between the three schools and various groups of students (b) The ACT Academic Advisement Survey will be given. (c) Fall Semester 1990 and Spring Semester 1991.

2) Discomforts, inconveniences, and/or risks that can reasonable to expected are: None

3) I understand the procedures to be used in this study and the possible risk involved. If I have any further questions about this study, I understand that I can call Jim Daniel at 615-247-7516 or Dr. Hal Knight, at 615-929=4430 who will try to answer any additional questions that I might have. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form to read at leisure.

I also understand that while my rights and privacy will be maintained, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and the ETSU Institutional Review Board do have free access to any information obtained in this study should it become necessary and I freely and voluntarily choose to participate. I understand that I may withdraw at any time without prejudice to me. I also understnad that while East Tennessee State University does not provide compensation for medical treatment other than emergency first aid, for any physical injury which may occur as a result of my participation as a subject in this study, claims arising against Claims Commission for disposition to the extend allowable as provided under TCA Section 9-8-307. Further information concerning this may be obtained from the Chairman of the Institutional Review Board.

Date	Signature of Volunteer
Date	Signature of Parents or Guardian
Date	Signature of Witness (if applicable)
Date	Signature of Investigator

Appendix F

Overall Responses to

Sections II, III, IV, & V of the Survey

Appendix F

Overall Responses

Item (Survey Question)	n	mean
How well satisfied (II-A)	477	3.16
Academic progress (III-1)	313	3.66
Scheduling/Regist. (III-2)	371	3.80
Drop/Add courses (III-3)	294	3.77
Non-trad.course credit (III-4)	207	3.24
Changing major (III-5)	231	3.69
Requirements needed (III-6)	317	3.64
Skills and habits (III-7)	201	3.41
Matching style with courses (III-8)	202	3.41
Tutorial assistance (III-9)	184	3.33
Life/career goals (III-10)	237	3.53
Matching skills/careers (III-11)	226	3.48
Academic difficulties (III-12)	226	3.41
Financial aid (III-13)	295	3.34
Obtaining employment (III-14)	187	3.27
Job placement (III-15)	209	3.31
Continuing education (III-16)	209	3.43
Wd/Transfer procedures (III-17)	166	3.34

Appendix F

Overall Responses

Item (Survey Question)	n	mean
Personal problems (III-18)	182	3.42
Knows me (IV-1)	435	3.60
Good listener (IV-2)	432	3.90
Shows interest in me (IV-3)	424	3.55
Respects my opinions (IV-4)	425	3.83
Available as needed (IV-5)	432	3.64
Open and caring atmosphere (IV-6)	421	3.67
Open communication (IV-7)	425	3.64
Respects my decisions (IV-8)	426	3.93
Accurate information (IV-9)	425	3.71
Communicates changes (IV-10)	412	3.33
Refers me if needed (IV-11)	402	3.49
Encourages active planning (IV-12)	414	3.71
Accepts constructive feedback(IV-13)	358	3.33
Encouragement of ed. goals (IV-14)	417	3.80
Helps identify obstacles (IV-15)	395	3.51
Initiates meetings (IV-16)	408	2.94
Punctual (IV-17)	396	3.79
Defines responsibilities (IV-18)	405	3.40
Allows sufficient time (IV-19)	422	3.79
Talks of personal problems (IV-20)	345	3.39

Appendix F

Overall Responses

Item (Survey Question)	n	mean
Anticipates needs (IV-21)	395	3.29
Selection of courses (IV-22)	409	3.61
Examines student needs (IV-23)	361	3.46
Knows academic background (IV-24)	420	3.50
Encourages me to communicate (IV-25)	390	3.13
Academic discipline (IV-26)	398	3.45
Extracurricular activies (IV-27)	369	3.12
Helps explore careers (IV-28)	393	3.28
Knowledgeable of all courses (IV-29)	402	3.49
Enjoys advising (IV-30)	420	3.68
Approachable (IV-31)	425	3.85
Shows concern (IV-32)	409	3.50
Respects confidentiality (IV-33)	376	3.88
Flexible (IV-34)	419	3.74
Sense of humor (IV-35)	419	3.89
Recommendable (IV-36)	425	3.69

Appendix G

Responses to Sections II, III, IV, & V of the Survey

by Institution

Appendix G

Responses to Section II, III, IV, and V of the Survey

	Austin Peay		East Tennessee		Middle Tennessee		df within & between	
Item (Survey Question)	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n		F
How well satisfied (II-A)	3.20	174	3.14	106	3.14	197	2, 474	0.23
Academic progress (III-1)	3.68	114	3.75	56	3.61	143	2, 310	0.39
Scheduling/Regist.(III-2)	3.88	142	3.90	68	3.68	161	2, 368	1.64
Drop/Add courses (III-3)	3.68	111	3.65	40	3.87	143	2, 291	1.61
Non-trad.courses (III-4)	3.12	76	3.29	34	3.32	97	2, 204	0.89
Changing major (III-5)	3.63	83	3.78	40	3.71	103	2, 231	0.41
Requirements (III-6)	3.73	113	3.64	58	3.57	146	2, 314	0.71
Skills and habits (III-7)	3.42	86	3.53	30	3.35	85	2, 188	0.46
Matching courses (III-8)	3.43	84	3.44	25	3.39	93	2, 199	0.05

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix G

Responses to Section II, III, IV, and V of the Survey

Item (Survey Question)	Austin Peay mean	n	East Tennessee mean	n	Middle Tennessee mean	n	df within & between	F
Tutorial assist. (III-9)	3.29	77	3.31	26	3.37	81	2, 181	0.19
Life/career goals (III-10)	3.52	91	3.54	37	3.53	109	2, 234	0.01
Skills/careers (III-11)	3.39	89	3.54	35	3.53	102	2, 223	0.52
Coping/academics (III-12)	3.36	95	3.37	35	3.48	96	2, 223	0.36
Financial aid (III-13)	3.17	78	3.35	31	3.50	86	2, 192	2.26
Obtaining jobs (III-14)	3.22	77	3.29	31	3.32	79	2, 184	0.23
Job placement (III-15)	3.27	76	3.21	33	3.38	101	2, 206	0.43
Continuing Ed. (III-16)	3.36	84	3.56	34	3.45	91	2, 206	0.61
Wd/Transfer (III-17)	3.31	70	3.26	23	3.40	73	2, 163	0.31
Personal problems (III-18)l	3.46	79	3.40	25	3.38	78	2, 179	0.11
Knows me (IV-1)	3.65	156	3.41	92	3.64	187	2, 432	1.06
Good listener (IV-2)	3.92	154	3.90	92	3.88	186	2, 429	0.09

Appendix G

Responses to Section II, III, IV, and V of the Survey

Item (Survey Question)	Austin Peay Institution mean	n	East Tennessee mean	n	Middle Tennessee mean	n	df within & between	F
Shows interest (IV-3)	3.60	151	3.62	89	3.47	184	2, 421	0.71
Respects opinions (IV-4)	3.88	152	3.87	89	3.76	184	2, 422	0.77
Available as needed (IV-5)	3.80	153	3.74	91	3.46	188	2, 429	4.57 **
Open and caring (IV-6)	3.78	150	3.65	89	3.58	182	2, 418	1.53
Open communication (IV-7)	3.74	151	3.66	90	3.56	184	2, 422	1.21
Respects decisions (IV-8)	3.93	152	3.93	90	3.94	184	2, 423	0.01
Accurate information (IV-9)	3.75	151	3.68	90	3.68	184	2, 422	0.20
Tells me changes (IV-10)	3.39	147	3.19	86	3.35	179	2, 409	0.83
Refers if needed (IV-11)	3.61	148	3.18	83	3.53	171	2, 399	4.18 *

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix G

Responses to Section II, III, IV, and V of the Survey

	Austin Peay		East Tennessee		Middle Tennessee		df within & between	
Item (Survey Question)	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n		F
Encourages planning (IV-12)	3.79	148	3.56	85	3.72	181	2, 411	1.26
Accepts feedback (IV-13)	3.34	129	3.26	74	3.36	155	2, 355	0.31
Helps with ed. goal (IV-14)	3.83	150	3.75	89	3.79	178	2, 214	0.14
Identifies obstacles(IV-15)	3.60	143	3.42	83	3.48	169	2, 392	0.87
Initiates meetings (IV-16)	3.13	148	2.72	86	2.88	174	2, 405	3.42*
Punctual (IV-17)	3.76	144	3.89	83	3.76	169	2, 393	0.60
Defines duties (IV-18)	3.46	147	3.40	83	3.35	175	2, 402	0.40
Allows enough time (IV-19)	3.81	150	3.76	90	3.80	182	2, 419	0.09
Personal problems (IV-20)	3.44	133	3.22	68	3.43	144	2, 342	1.40
Anticipates needs (IV-21)	3.39	143	3.18	82	3.25	170	2, 392	1.42

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix G

Responses to Section II, III, IV, and V of the Survey

Item (Survey Question)	Austin Peay mean	n	East Tennessee mean	n	Middle Tennessee mean	n	df within & between	F
Selects courses (IV-22)	3.70	145	3.57	89	3.57	178	2, 406	0.66
Examines my needs (IV-23)	3.47	141	3.43	80	3.46	170	2, 388	0.05
Academic background (IV-24)	3.54	147	3.38	89	3.52	184	2, 417	0.60
Helps to communicate(IV-25)	3.14	140	3.00	81	3.17	169	2, 387	0.74
Academic discipline (IV-26)	3.43	144	3.38	81	3.51	173	2, 395	0.48
Other activies (IV-27)	3.20	137	2.84	70	3.17	162	2, 369	2.99
Explore careers (IV-28)	3.26	142	3.19	79	3.34	172	2, 390	0.57
Knows all courses (IV-29)	3.51	145	3.35	84	3.53	173	2, 399	0.94
Enjoys advising (IV-30)	3.73	149	3.82	91	3.57	180	2, 417	1.96
Approachable (IV-31)	3.91	152	3.80	90	3.83	183	2, 422	0.36
Shows concern (IV-32)	3.55	150	3.44	86	3.50	173	2, 406	0.26

Appendix G

Responses to Section II, III, IV, and V of the Survey

Item (Survey Question)	Austin Peay Institution mean	n	East Tennessee Institution mean	n	Middle Tennessee Institution mean	n	df within & between	F
Confidentiality (IV-33)	3.84	137	3.91	79	3.90	160	2, 373	0.24
Flexible (IV-34)	3.76	150	3.73	90	3.72	179	2, 416	0.07
Sense of humor (IV-35)	3.85	149	3.91	88	3.92	182	2, 416	0.19
Recommendable (IV-36)	3.76	152	3.74	91	3.62	182	2, 422	0.56

Appendix H

Responses to Sections II, III, IV, & V of the Survey

by Gender

Appendix H

Gender

Item (Survey Question)	Males			Females			df	t
	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD		
How well satisfied (II-A)	152	3.20	0.96	322	3.14	0.98	472	0.57
Academic progress (III-1)	106	3.76	0.92	204	3.60	1.11	308	1.40
Scheduling/Regist. (III-2)	113	3.73	0.97	255	3.84	1.11	366	-0.91
Drop/Add courses (III-3)	103	3.83	0.80	188	3.74	0.99	289	0.81
Non-trad.course credit (III-4)	74	3.28	0.99	131	3.22	1.04	203	0.42
Changing major (III-5)	82	3.59	0.87	147	3.74	0.95	227	-1.23
Requirements needed (III-6)	100	3.62	1.07	214	3.65	1.13	312	-0.22
Skills and habits (III-7)	70	3.41	0.77	129	3.41	0.97	197	0.03
Style with courses (III-8)	69	3.45	0.87	130	3.40	1.01	197	0.34
Tutorial assistance (III-9)	66	3.42	0.68	116	3.27	0.98	180	1.27
Life/career goals (III-10)	86	3.66	0.85	148	3.47	1.11	232	1.52
Matching skills/careers (III-11)	82	3.59	0.89	141	3.43	1.06	221	1.15
academic difficulties (III-12)	77	3.42	0.86	146	3.41	1.11	221	0.03
Financial aid (III-13)	73	3.33	0.85	119	3.34	1.10	190	-0.11
Obtaining employment (III-14)	67	3.43	0.86	117	3.19	0.91	182	1.79
Job placement (III-15)	79	3.44	0.97	127	3.24	1.05	204	1.41
Continuing education (III-16)	77	3.58	0.83	129	3.35	0.98	204	1.76
Wd/Transfer procedures (III-17)	62	3.40	0.73	101	3.32	0.88	161	0.65

Appendix H

Gender

Item (Survey Question)	Males			Females			df	t
	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD		
Personal problems (III-18)	65	3.35	0.84	114	3.46	1.02	177	-0.74
Knows me (IV-1)	146	3.78	1.27	284	3.51	1.39	429	1.94
Good listener (IV-2)	145	3.92	0.99	282	3.88	0.98	425	0.41
Shows interest in me (IV-3)	141	3.62	1.17	278	3.53	1.15	417	0.83
Respects my opinions (IV-4)	144	3.85	0.97	276	3.82	0.94	418	0.25
Available as needed (IV-5)	144	3.75	1.03	283	3.58	1.11	425	1.50
Open and caring atmosphere (IV-6)	143	3.73	1.04	273	3.64	1.02	414	0.81
Open communication (IV-7)	143	3.69	1.04	277	3.62	1.09	418	0.62
Respects my decisions (IV-8)	144	3.97	0.94	277	3.92	0.93	419	0.43
Accurate information (IV-9)	141	3.72	1.08	279	3.70	1.16	418	0.21
Communicates changes (IV-10)	139	3.43	1.11	268	3.29	1.22	405	1.17
Refers me if needed (IV-11)	135	3.57	1.05	262	3.47	1.15	395	0.88
Encourages planning (IV-12)	139	3.73	1.03	270	3.72	1.06	407	0.07
Accepts feedback (IV-13)	124	3.45	0.97	229	3.28	0.95	352	1.65
Encouragement of ed. goals(IV-14)	138	3.79	1.08	274	3.81	1.01	410	-0.22
Helps identify obstacles (IV-15)	137	3.55	1.01	253	3.49	1.10	388	0.54

Appendix H

Gender

Item (Survey Question)	Males			Females			df	t
	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD		
Initiates meetings (IV-16)	133	3.13	1.21	270	2.85	1.22	401	2.14*
Punctual (IV-17)	132	3.79	0.96	259	3.79	0.98	389	0.00
Defines responsibilities (IV-18)	133	3.43	1.05	267	3.39	1.09	398	0.38
Allows sufficient time (IV-19)	141	3.77	1.02	276	3.80	0.96	415	-0.31
Personal problems (IV-20)	116	3.43	0.99	224	3.39	0.95	338	0.39
Anticipates needs (IV-21)	137	3.31	0.94	254	3.28	0.98	389	0.26
Selection of courses (IV-22)	140	3.59	1.04	264	3.62	1.10	402	-0.25
Examines student needs (IV-23)	134	3.46	1.01	252	3.46	1.05	384	0.06
Familiar with background (IV-24)	142	3.56	1.15	273	3.47	1.14	413	0.80
Encourages communication (IV-25)	131	3.21	0.96	254	3.08	1.12	383	1.14
Academic discipline (IV-26)	136	3.59	0.97	257	3.40	1.04	391	1.77
Extracurricular activies (IV-27)	130	3.31	1.13	234	3.02	1.02	362	2.47 *
Helps explore careers (IV-28)	136	3.54	0.99	252	3.16	1.12	386	3.36 ***
Knowledgeable of courses (IV-29)	139	3.53	0.97	258	3.46	1.10	395	0.64
Enjoys advising (IV-30)	142	3.63	1.05	273	3.71	1.06	413	-0.73

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix H

Gender

Item (Survey Question)	Males			Females			df	t
	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD		
Approachable (IV-31)	144	3.88	1.05	276	3.84	1.11	418	0.34
Shows concern (IV-32)	138	3.57	1.09	266	3.48	1.09	402	0.70
Respects confidentiality (IV-33)	129	3.84	0.86	242	3.90	0.89	369	-0.71
Flexible (IV-34)	140	3.74	0.95	274	3.74	0.97	412	0.06
Sense of humor (IV-35)	142	3.97	0.91	272	3.86	1.05	412	1.07
Recommendable (IV-36)	144	3.82	1.19	276	3.63	1.26	418	1.46

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix I

Responses to Sections II, III, IV, & V of the Survey by Marital Status

Appendix I

Marital Status

Item (Survey Question)	Unmarried n	mean	SD	Married/Sep m	mean	SD	df	t
How well satisfied (II-A)	359	3.16	0.95	114	3.18	1.07	471	-0.18
Academic progress (III-1)	233	3.69	1.03	77	3.55	1.12	310	1.06
Scheduling/Regist. (III-2)	279	3.84	1.06	89	3.70	1.10	366	1.07
Drop/Add courses (III-3)	214	3.76	0.94	77	3.79	0.89	289	-0.25
Non-trad.course credit (III-4)	149	3.32	1.04	56	3.05	0.94	203	1.65
Changing major (III-5)	171	3.67	0.96	58	3.71	0.82	227	-0.20
Requirements needed (III-6)	231	3.70	1.10	83	3.48	1.13	312	1.52
Skills and habits (III-7)	148	3.41	0.93	51	3.43	0.81	197	-0.18
Matching style/courses (III-8)	142	3.44	0.98	57	3.35	0.92	197	0.62
Tutorial assistance (III-9)	131	3.31	0.86	51	3.37	0.96	180	-0.46
Life/career goals (III-10)	170	3.61	1.00	64	3.36	1.07	232	1.65
Skills with careers (III-11)	163	3.51	1.01	60	3.42	1.00	221	0.61
Academic difficulties (III-12)	163	3.39	1.04	60	3.47	1.00	221	-0.48
Financial aid (III-13)	139	3.35	1.01	53	3.32	1.01	190	0.15
Obtaining employment (III-14)	134	3.28	0.90	50	3.28	0.88	182	-0.03
Job placement (III-15)	152	3.34	1.02	54	3.24	1.03	204	0.62
Continuing education (III-16)	147	3.39	0.93	59	3.54	0.93	204	-1.03
Wd/Transfer procedures (III-17)	119	3.34	0.82	44	3.36	0.87	161	-0.13
Personal problems (III-18)	130	3.40	0.98	49	3.49	0.92	177	-0.56

Appendix I

Marital Status

Item (Survey Question)	Unmarried			Married/Sep			df	t
	n	mean	SD	m	mean	SD		
Knows me (IV-1)	329	3.61	1.36	101	3.57	1.34	428	0.26
Good listener (IV-2)	324	3.89	0.97	103	3.92	1.02	425	-0.30
Shows interest in me (IV-3)	318	3.57	1.14	101	3.53	1.20	417	0.24
Respects my opinions (IV-4)	319	3.83	0.93	101	3.82	1.01	418	0.11
Available as needed (IV-5)	324	3.71	1.06	103	3.42	1.13	425	2.39*
Open caring atmosphere (IV-6)	317	3.68	1.03	99	3.63	1.04	414	0.49
Open communication (IV-7)	320	3.68	1.06	100	3.51	1.10	418	1.40
Respects my decisions (IV-8)	320	3.98	0.90	101	3.79	1.02	419	1.81
Accurate information (IV-9)	319	3.75	1.11	101	3.57	1.20	418	1.35
Communicates changes (IV-10)	308	3.37	1.16	99	3.23	1.28	405	1.01
Refers me if needed (IV-11)	304	3.51	1.09	93	3.48	1.21	395	0.17
Encourages planning (IV-12)	310	3.72	1.03	99	3.74	1.11	407	-0.18
Accepts feedback (IV-13)	267	3.34	0.93	86	3.33	1.06	351	0.13
Encouragement ed. goals (IV-14)	311	3.82	1.02	101	3.77	1.08	410	0.38
Helps identify obstacles (IV-15)	296	3.52	1.04	94	3.47	1.16	388	0.41

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix I

Marital Status

Item (Survey Question)	Unmarried n	mean	SD	Married/Sep m	mean	SD	df	t
Initiates meetings (IV-16)	303	2.95	1.20	100	2.93	1.28	401	0.12
Punctual (IV-17)	295	3.83	0.96	96	3.66	0.99	389	1.53
Defines responsibilities (IV-18)	300	3.45	1.03	100	3.26	1.18	398	1.51
Allows sufficient time (IV-19)	317	3.82	0.99	100	3.72	0.96	415	0.86
Personal problems (IV-20)	256	3.39	0.99	84	3.45	0.87	338	-0.54
Anticipates needs (IV-21)	296	3.29	0.94	95	3.28	1.06	389	0.06
Selection of courses (IV-22)	309	3.66	1.09	95	3.46	1.03	402	1.54
Examines student needs (IV-23)	295	3.45	1.05	91	3.47	0.99	384	-0.15
Familiar with background (IV-24)	315	3.53	1.13	100	3.41	1.20	413	0.92
Encourages communication (IV-25)	290	3.12	1.07	95	3.15	1.06	383	-0.21
Academic discipline (IV-26)	300	3.47	1.03	93	3.41	1.00	391	0.36
Extracurricular activies (IV-27)	280	3.16	1.09	84	2.99	0.99	362	1.33
Helps explore careers (IV-28)	295	3.35	1.10	93	3.11	1.07	386	1.89
Knowledgeable of courses (IV-29)	303	3.48	1.06	94	3.51	1.05	397	-0.26
Enjoys advising (IV-30)	315	3.69	1.07	100	3.68	1.02	413	0.07
Approachable (IV-31)	320	3.87	1.09	100	3.80	1.09	418	0.53
Shows concern (IV-32)	306	3.53	1.06	98	3.46	1.16	402	0.56
Respects confidentiality (IV-33)	284	3.87	0.89	87	3.92	0.81	369	-0.46
Flexible (IV-34)	315	3.74	0.96	99	3.73	0.98	412	0.14

Appendix I

Marital Status

Item (Survey Question)	Unmarried			Married/Sep			df	t
	n	mean	SD	m	mean	SD		
Sense of humor (IV-35)	315	3.92	1.02	99	3.82	0.95	412	0.91
Recommendable (IV-36)	319	3.75	1.21	101	3.52	1.31	418	1.61

Appendix J

Responses to Sections II, III, IV, & V of the Survey

by Enrollment Status

Appendix J

Enrollment Status

Item (Survey Question)	Full Time			Part Time			df	t
	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD		
How well satisfied (II-A)	438	3.18	0.97	35	2.89	1.02	471	1.73
Academic progress (III-1)	291	3.66	1.05	18	3.44	0.98	307	0.86
Scheduling/Regist. (III-2)	348	3.84	1.04	19	2.95	1.18	365	3.63***
Drop/Add courses (III-3)	272	3.79	0.93	18	3.33	0.77	288	2.06*
Non-trad.course credit (III-4)	194	3.27	1.01	11	2.82	1.08	203	1.43
Changing major (III-5)	216	3.69	0.94	13	3.54	0.66	227	0.59
Requirements needed (III-6)	295	3.65	1.13	19	3.47	0.77	312	0.67
Skills and habits (III-7)	185	3.43	0.90	14	3.21	0.89	197	0.85
Style with courses (III-8)	186	3.45	0.95	12	2.92	1.08	194	1.88
Tutorial assistance (III-9)	170	3.34	0.87	12	3.08	1.08	180	0.97
Life/career goals (III-10)	219	3.55	1.03	15	3.40	0.91	232	0.54
Skills with careers (III-11)	210	3.50	1.01	13	3.23	0.83	221	0.94
Academic difficulties (III-12)	209	3.43	1.03	14	3.21	1.05	221	0.75
Financial aid (III-13)	182	3.38	0.99	10	2.50	0.97	190	2.74**
Obtaining employment (III-14)	172	3.29	0.90	12	3.08	0.79	182	0.77

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix J

Enrollment Status

Item (Survey Question)	Full Time			Part Time			df	t
	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD		
Job placement (III-15)	194	3.30	1.04	12	3.58	0.67	204	-0.93
Continuing education (III-16)	194	3.43	0.95	12	3.50	0.67	204	-0.24
Wd/Transfer procedures (III-17)	152	3.38	0.84	11	3.00	0.45	161	2.48*
Personal problems (III-18)	168	3.43	0.98	11	3.27	0.65	177	0.54
Knows me (IV-1)	405	3.66	1.34	24	2.79	1.44	427	3.07**
Good listener (IV-2)	401	3.92	0.97	25	3.52	0.12	424	1.98*
Shows interest in me (IV-3)	394	3.59	1.15	24	3.00	1.22	416	2.45*
Respects my opinions (IV-4)	394	3.86	0.93	25	3.36	1.15	417	2.57*
Available as needed (IV-5)	401	3.66	1.09	25	3.24	0.93	424	1.89
Open and caring atmosphere (IV-6)	392	3.70	1.02	24	3.17	1.05	414	2.49*
Open communication (IV-7)	394	3.66	1.06	25	3.28	1.21	417	1.73
Respects my decisions (IV-8)	395	3.97	0.90	25	3.44	1.26	418	2.07*
Accurate information (IV-9)	395	3.74	1.12	24	3.17	1.27	417	2.41*
Communicates changes (IV-10)	382	3.37	1.17	24	2.83	1.34	404	2.15*
Refers me if needed (IV-11)	373	3.55	1.09	23	2.74	1.32	394	3.42***
Encourages planning (IV-12)	384	3.76	1.02	24	3.13	1.30	406	2.90**

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix J

Enrollment Status

Item (Survey Question)	Full Time			Part Time			df	t
	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD		
Accepts feedback (IV-13)	329	3.35	0.95	23	3.17	1.11	351	0.85
Educational goals (IV-14)	387	3.84	1.01	24	3.17	1.20	409	3.15**
Helps identify obstacles (IV-15)	364	3.54	1.06	25	2.96	1.21	387	2.65**
Initiates meetings (IV-16)	378	2.94	1.22	24	2.92	1.32	400	0.10
Punctual (IV-17)	366	3.82	0.96	24	3.38	1.10	388	2.17*
Defines responsibilities (IV-18)	374	3.42	1.07	25	3.08	1.15	397	1.54
Allows sufficient time (IV-19)	392	3.81	0.99	24	3.54	0.93	414	1.29
Personal problems (IV-20)	318	3.42	0.97	21	3.24	0.83	337	0.82
Anticipates needs (IV-21)	367	3.30	0.97	23	3.13	0.92	388	0.81
Selection of courses (IV-22)	380	3.63	1.07	23	3.26	1.18	401	1.60
Examines student needs (IV-23)	362	3.47	1.03	23	3.30	1.15	383	0.74
Familiar with background (IV-24)	390	3.52	1.14	24	3.21	1.25	412	1.30
Encourages to communicate (IV-25)	361	3.14	1.07	23	2.96	1.11	382	0.79
Academic discipline (IV-26)	369	3.48	1.02	23	3.13	1.10	390	1.60
Extracurricular activies (IV-27)	340	3.14	1.06	23	2.91	1.16	361	0.98
Helps explore careers (IV-28)	365	3.31	1.09	22	3.05	1.21	385	1.09

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix J

Enrollment Status

Item (Survey Question)	Full Time			Part Time			df	t
	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD		
Knowledgeable of courses (IV-29)	373	3.51	1.06	23	3.04	1.02	394	2.07*
Enjoys advising (IV-30)	391	3.70	1.06	23	3.39	0.99	412	1.37
Approachable (IV-31)	395	3.89	1.08	24	3.25	1.15	417	2.80**
Shows concern (IV-32)	380	3.54	1.08	23	3.04	1.15	401	2.14*
Respects confidentiality (IV-33)	350	3.91	0.86	20	3.50	1.00	368	2.03*
Flexible (IV-34)	389	3.77	0.95	24	3.21	1.10	411	2.80**
Sense of humor (IV-35)	391	3.93	0.98	23	3.30	1.15	412	2.95**
Recommendable (IV-36)	395	3.72	1.24	24	3.25	1.19	417	1.82

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix K

Responses to Sections II, III, IV, & V of the Survey by Administration

Appendix K

Participants

Item (Survey Question)	First Adminis n	mean	SD	Second Adminis n	mean	SD	df	t
How well satisfied (II-A)	324	3.13	0.98	153	3.23	0.98	475	-1.03
Academic progress (III-1)	205	3.60	1.02	108	3.77	1.08	311	-1.36
Scheduling/Regist. (III-2)	244	3.70	1.09	127	3.98	1.00	369	-2.44*
Drop/Add courses (III-3)	201	3.70	0.96	93	3.91	0.82	292	-1.84
Non-trad.course credit (III-4)	146	3.21	0.99	61	3.33	1.08	205	-0.79
Changing major (III-5)	159	3.64	0.99	72	3.81	0.74	229	-1.45
Requirements needed (III-6)	205	3.56	1.04	112	3.79	1.22	315	-1.65
Skills and habits (III-7)	143	3.36	0.88	58	3.53	0.92	199	-1.28
Style with courses (III-8)	145	3.38	0.94	57	3.49	1.00	200	-0.75
Tutorial assistance (III-9)	132	3.36	0.86	52	3.25	0.95	182	0.73
Life/career goals (III-10)	159	3.51	1.01	78	3.56	1.06	235	-0.39
Skills with careers (III-11)	157	3.47	0.95	69	3.49	1.12	224	-0.15
Academic difficulties (III-12)	153	3.40	1.00	73	3.44	1.11	224	-0.27
Financial aid (III-13)	139	3.32	1.01	56	3.39	1.02	193	-0.43

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix K

Participants

Item (Survey Question)	First Adminis n	mean	SD	Second Adminis n	mean	SD	df	t
Obtaining employment (III-14)	132	3.20	0.83	55	3.45	1.00	185	-1.82
Job placement (III-15)	146	3.29	1.00	63	3.35	1.06	207	-0.36
Continuing education (III-16)	147	3.39	0.91	62	3.53	0.97	207	-1.03
Wd/Transfer procedures (III-17)	125	3.36	0.85	41	3.29	0.75	164	0.45
Personal problems (III-18)	129	3.40	0.89	53	3.47	1.10	180	-0.49
Knows me (IV-1)	288	3.42	1.38	147	3.95	1.24	433	-3.91***
Good listener (IV-2)	284	3.85	0.98	148	3.99	0.98	430	-1.35
Shows interest in me (IV-3)	280	3.49	1.17	144	3.67	1.14	422	-1.49
Respects my opinions (IV-4)	281	3.78	0.96	144	3.91	0.93	431	-1.30
Available as needed (IV-5)	285	3.64	1.06	147	3.65	1.13	430	-0.10
Open and caring atmosphere (IV-6)	277	3.64	1.05	144	3.73	0.99	419	-0.89
Open communication (IV-7)	281	3.60	1.10	144	3.73	0.99	423	-1.17
Respects my decisions (IV-8)	282	3.87	0.99	144	4.07	0.80	424	-2.29*
Accurate information (IV-9)	280	3.71	1.14	145	3.70	1.14	435	0.06
Communicates changes (IV-10)	277	3.34	1.19	135	3.30	1.20	410	0.31
Refers me if needed (IV-11)	266	3.42	1.16	136	3.63	1.05	400	-1.75

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix K

Participants

Item (Survey Question)	First Adminis n	mean	SD	Second Adminis n	mean	SD	df	t
Encourages active planning(IV-12)	277	3.64	1.07	137	3.86	0.99	412	-2.00*
Accepts feedback (IV-13)	245	3.36	0.95	113	3.27	0.98	356	0.78
Encouragement of ed. goals(IV-14)	273	3.78	1.03	144	3.83	1.07	415	-0.53
Helps identify obstacles (IV-15)	263	3.52	1.05	132	3.49	1.12	393	0.25
Initiates meetings (IV-16)	269	2.96	1.22	139	2.89	1.22	406	0.53
Punctual (IV-17)	261	3.70	0.97	135	3.96	0.94	394	-2.50*
Defines responsibilities (IV-18)	272	3.42	1.05	133	3.35	1.12	403	0.58
Allows sufficient time (IV-19)	277	3.74	0.97	145	3.89	0.99	420	-1.45
Personal problems (IV-20)	235	3.35	0.96	110	3.48	0.96	343	-1.16
Anticipates needs (IV-21)	262	3.31	0.98	133	3.24	0.95	393	0.70
Selection of courses (IV-22)	275	3.63	1.08	134	3.57	1.08	407	0.51
Examines student needs (IV-23)	262	3.45	1.03	129	3.47	1.05	389	-0.10
Familiar with background (IV-24)	276	3.45	1.14	144	3.58	1.15	418	-1.11
Helps me communicate (IV-25)	258	3.09	1.03	132	3.20	1.13	388	-0.95
Academic discipline (IV-26)	266	3.44	1.01	132	3.48	1.05	396	-0.31
Extracurricular activies (IV-27)	246	3.15	1.09	123	3.07	1.02	367	0.70

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix K

Participants

Item (Survey Question)	First Adminis n	mean	SD	Second Adminis n	mean	SD	df	t
Helps explore careers (IV-28)	264	3.31	1.08	129	3.22	1.13	391	0.83
Knowledgeable of courses (IV-29)	270	3.49	1.02	132	3.48	1.14	400	0.00
Enjoys advising (IV-30)	274	3.64	1.04	146	3.77	1.08	418	-1.28
Approachable (IV-31)	279	3.82	1.07	146	3.90	1.12	423	-0.75
Shows concern (IV-32)	272	3.45	1.09	137	3.61	1.07	407	-1.45
Respects confidentiality (IV-33)	250	3.82	0.88	126	3.99	0.85	374	-1.77
Flexible (IV-34)	276	3.69	0.99	143	3.83	0.90	417	-1.46
Sense of humor (IV-35)	275	3.82	1.04	144	4.03	0.94	417	-2.09*
Recommendable (IV-36)	279	3.66	1.20	146	3.77	1.31	423	-0.88

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix L

Responses to Sections II, III, IV, & V of the Survey

by Age

Appendix L

AGE

Item (Survey Question)	Traditional n	Traditional mean	Traditional SD	Non-Trad. n	Non-Trad. mean	Non-Trad. SD	df	t
How well satisfied (II-A)	359	3.17	0.93	115	3.13	1.13	472	0.34
Academic progress (III-1)	234	3.65	1.03	76	3.66	1.10	308	-0.03
Scheduling/Regist. (III-2)	285	3.81	1.06	83	3.78	1.09	366	0.18
Drop/Add courses (III-3)	218	3.74	0.94	73	3.85	0.86	289	-0.85
Non-trad. credit (III-4)	155	3.28	0.97	50	3.12	1.15	203	0.99
Changing major (III-5)	180	3.68	0.94	49	3.69	0.89	227	-0.07
Requirements needed(III-6)	234	3.61	1.11	80	3.73	1.12	312	-0.79
Skills and habits (III-7)	154	3.39	0.89	45	3.49	0.94	197	-0.65
Style with courses (III-8)	149	3.40	0.94	50	3.46	1.01	197	-0.36
Tutorial assistance(III-9)	137	3.34	0.82	45	3.29	1.06	180	0.27
Life/career goals (III-10)	172	3.55	0.98	62	3.52	1.14	232	0.20
Skills/careers (III-11)	167	3.46	1.02	56	3.55	0.97	221	-0.60
Academic difficulties (III-12)	168	3.39	0.99	55	3.47	1.14	239	-0.50
Financial aid (III-13)	146	3.40	0.99	46	3.13	1.05	190	1.61
Obtaining employment (III-14)	140	3.24	0.87	44	3.41	0.97	182	-1.12
Job placement (III-15)	155	3.28	1.06	51	3.41	0.92	204	-0.77
Continuing education (III-16)	154	3.40	0.89	52	3.56	1.06	204	-1.08

Appendix L

AGE

Item (Survey Question)	Traditional			Non-Trad.			df	t
	n	mean	SD	n	mean	SD		
Wd/Transfer procedures (III-17)	128	3.36	0.80	35	3.31	0.93	161	0.28
Personal problems (III-18)	136	3.39	0.94	43	3.53	1.03	177	-0.86
Knows me (IV-1)	330	3.51	1.36	100	3.91	1.30	428	-2.59**
Good listener (IV-2)	326	3.86	0.96	101	4.03	1.03	434	-1.56
Shows interest in me (IV-3)	321	3.54	1.12	98	3.62	1.27	417	-0.63
Respects my opinions (IV-4)	320	3.80	0.90	100	3.92	1.08	418	-0.98
Available as needed (IV-5)	326	3.64	1.07	101	3.63	1.16	425	0.06
Open and caring atmosphere (IV-6)	318	3.65	1.01	98	3.74	1.11	414	-0.82
Open communication (IV-7)	321	3.65	1.04	99	3.62	1.18	418	0.26
Respects my decisions (IV-8)	323	3.93	0.91	98	3.98	1.00	419	-0.50
Accurate information (IV-9)	320	3.75	1.13	100	3.57	1.14	418	1.39
Communicates changes (IV-10)	311	3.35	1.16	96	3.30	1.26	405	0.33
Refers me if needed (IV-11)	303	3.44	1.09	94	3.70	1.20	395	-2.00*
Encourages planning (IV-12)	313	3.68	1.02	96	3.85	1.14	407	-1.42
Accepts feedback (IV-13)	269	3.31	0.92	84	3.43	1.08	351	-1.00
Encourages ed. goals (IV-14)	312	3.78	0.99	100	3.89	1.14	410	-0.94

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

Appendix L

AGE

Item (Survey Question)	Traditional n	mean	SD	Non-Trad. n	mean	SD	df	t
Helps identify obstacles (IV-15)	296	3.53	1.04	94	3.45	1.18	388	0.63
Initiates meetings (IV-16)	306	2.93	1.19	97	2.99	1.33	401	-0.43
Punctual (IV-17)	296	3.76	0.95	95	3.87	1.02	389	-0.99
Defines responsibilities (IV-18)	303	3.40	1.02	97	3.39	1.23	398	0.08
Allows sufficient time (IV-19)	319	3.79	0.97	98	3.80	1.04	415	-0.02
Discusses personal problem(IV-20)	264	3.35	0.96	76	3.58	0.94	338	-1.82
Anticipates needs (IV-21)	299	3.28	0.93	92	3.32	1.08	389	-0.30
Selection of courses (IV-22)	311	3.64	1.05	93	3.52	1.17	402	0.97
Examines student needs (IV-23)	295	3.44	1.01	91	3.53	1.09	384	-0.73
Familiar with background (IV-24)	318	3.47	1.11	97	3.62	1.24	413	-1.15
Encourages to communicate (IV-25)	295	3.07	1.03	90	3.30	1.16	383	-1.76
Academic discipline (IV-26)	304	3.41	0.99	89	3.63	1.11	391	-1.75
Extracurricular activies (IV-27)	283	3.13	1.06	81	3.11	1.11	362	0.12
Helps explore careers (IV-28)	298	3.31	1.06	90	3.24	1.19	386	0.49
Knowledgeable of courses (IV-29)	305	3.48	1.06	92	3.52	1.05	395	-0.37
Enjoys advising (IV-30)	316	3.69	1.05	99	3.69	1.08	413	-0.00
Approachable (IV-31)	321	3.81	1.11	99	3.97	1.02	418	-1.25
Shows concern (IV-32)	309	3.49	1.06	95	3.60	1.18	402	-0.90

Appendix L

AGE

Item (Survey Question)	Traditional n	Traditional mean	Traditional SD	Non-Trad. n	Non-Trad. mean	Non-Trad. SD	df	t
Respects confidentiality (IV-33)	286	3.83	0.87	85	4.06	0.86	369	-2.14*
Flexible (IV-34)	317	3.71	0.95	97	3.84	1.00	412	-1.12
Sense of humor (IV-35)	317	3.87	1.01	97	3.99	0.98	412	-1.02
Recommendable (IV-36)	322	3.68	1.23	98	3.74	1.28	418	-0.43

* Statistically significant difference(s) at the .05 level.

** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .01 level.

*** Statistically significant difference(s) at the .001 level.

VITA

James L. Daniel

Personal Data:	Date of Birth: July 9, 1938 Place of Birth: Erwin, Tennessee Marital Status: Married
Education:	Public Schools: Kingsport, Tennessee and Daytona Beach, Florida East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee Psychology, B.S., 1984 East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee Psychology, M.A., 1986 East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee Administration, Ed.D., 1992
Professional Experience:	Marketing Manager, The Mason and Dixon Lines, Inc. Kingsport, Tennessee, 1961-1982 Commission Salesman Montgomery Ward, Inc. Kingsport, Tennessee,1983-1987 Instructor and Center Director, Bristol University Bristol, Tennessee, 1987-1989
Professional Experience cont.:	Instructor East Tennessee State University, College of Education Johnson City, Tennessee, 1989-1990 Psychological Examiner Self-employed, Kingsport, Tennessee 1989-present
Publications:	Burkett, C., Barnett, L. & Daniel, J. (1988, December). A Survey of public opinion toward schools in Sequatchie County, Tennessee. Paper presented at the meeting of the Sequatchie County School Board, Dunlap, Tennessee. Daniel, J. (1991). Advisement effectiveness: A comparison between Traditional and non-traditional students in three of Tennessee's regional universities. Unpublished dissertation, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City,

Tennessee.

Daniel, J. (1989). Financing adult education: Review of the literature. Unpublished manuscript.

157

Daniel, J. (1987). Adult student relations in U.S. Colleges and Universities: Implications for Administrators. Unpublished manuscript.

Daniel, J. (1986). Correlates of depression: Social networks, perceived physical health and religious practices and beliefs. Unpublished master's thesis, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.

Honors and Awards: Teacher of the Year, Bristol University